

# RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY of opinion and discussion

---

VOL. XXV

Summer, 1956

NO. 3

---

## CONTENTS

<b>Centrifugal Christian Sects . . . . .</b>	<b>323</b>
HORTON DAVIES, CHARLES S. BRADEN, CHARLES W. RANSON	
Crisis and Creativity . . . . .	ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR. 359
"Religion in Crisis and Custom"	
Rethinking the Protestant Doctrine of Vocation . . . . .	E. CLINTON GARDNER 366
The Body of Christ as Metaphor or Fact . . . . .	EDWIN MC NEILL POTEAT 378
Manuscripts and Peoples of the Judean Desert . . . . .	WALTER J. HARRELSON 386
What Do Our Church Buildings Say? . . . . .	JOHN R. SCOTFORD 397
Church Building in 1956 . . . . .	JAMES R. BLACKWOOD 409
Christian Hymnody as a Repository of Doctrine . . . . .	NORMAN F. LANGFORD 421
What <i>Is</i> a Church-Related College? . . . . .	WINSTON L. KING 432
Bibliographical Materials on the Episcopal Church . . . . .	NIELS H. SONNE 442
Book Reviews . . . . .	452
Book Notices . . . . .	479

## “Children of Light”

EMIL BRUNNER

FAITH IS RATHER LIKE a running stream, of which the water is fresh when drawn but becomes foul and stagnant when you let it stand. You must draw life from Christ every day anew, otherwise it becomes stale, impure and unreal, indeed ineffectual and dead. Just think how nonsensical it is—a life that is dead, a power that is ineffective.

Where then can we draw this water of life daily anew? . . . Whence do we derive the new life, the true life, the life in God? My friends, God has given us a *spring* from which we may draw the waters of eternal life. This spring is called *Jesus Christ*. “Whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him, will never thirst,” for his soul’s thirst is quenched with eternal life. But how can we contrive to draw this water of life from Jesus? If I am to express it in terms corresponding to the image of the cistern, I would say: we need for this purpose a vessel and we need a pulley with which to let it down. The vessel is faith. By faith alone can we apprehend Jesus Christ and eternal life in Him. And the pulley with which we let down the vessel is prayer. Many a time the vessel comes up empty because the rope was not long enough. We must take time over the business of drawing this water, by the reading of Holy Scripture or of some book calculated to enable us better to understand Holy Scripture or by that discourse with God which we term prayer.

—From *The Great Invitation*, by Emil Brunner, translated by Harold Knight, Copyright, 1955, by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission. (The Westminster Press.)

# Centrifugal Christian Sects

HORTON DAVIES

THE DESCRIPTIVE TERM, "CENTRIFUGAL," is applied here for the first time to those modern sects which are flying away from the center of historic Christianity with increasing momentum and impetus. They are commonly termed "Holiness" or "Adventist" or "Perfectionist" or "Pentecostal" sects. Their importance is that they seem not only to be increasing in numbers and in the effectiveness of their appeal today, but that they bid fair to constitute a fourth part of the Christian world—the other three segments being Roman Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism. While their intention is to be fully Christian, they are also largely anti-ecclesiastical. The sects represent, therefore, both a criticism of a Christianity which they believe to be largely conventional and self-satisfied where it is not actually Laodicean, and a challenge to the historic Christian communions.

The aim of this essay will be to describe, albeit briefly, the nature of these imitations, yet distortions, of the historic Churches, so that their challenge may be met constructively by appreciation as well as negatively by criticism. The presumption of describing beams in other eyes will be tempered to some degree by the evangelical recollection that there are motes in the eyes of the observer.

## THE PROBLEM OF THE SECTS

Divisiveness has often been characteristic of Christianity. Even those large communions which have most often criticized others for dissenting from their standards and fellowship can often claim to be united organizations only by the adoption of one or the other of two devices. Either they ignore bodies that separated from them several centuries ago as merely so much dead wood, or by allowing to institutions, orders, and "parties" within the unitive organization a relative autonomy they preserve an exterior façade of unity. It is of course possible to argue that there always have been divisions and sects; there always will be; therefore, there ought to be. But to argue that variety is the spice of ecclesiastical life is to pro-

---

HORTON DAVIES, D.Phil., who was until recently Professor at Mansfield College, Oxford, England, is now Professor of Religion at Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. He is author of the book, *Christian Deviations*, previously reviewed in RELIGION IN LIFE.

mulgate a gospel of Heinz; indeed, to outrival the pickle manufacturer by promoting more than fifty-seven varieties of products.

What is disturbing about this contemporary fissiparousness on the left wing of Protestantism is that it comes so inopportune. The Ecumenical Movement has made all but the most intransigent denominationalists feel guilty about beating their drums or blowing their trumpets of isolationism at this time when all sensitive Christians are laying seriously to heart the plea of their Lord before his Passion, when he prayed that all his disciples might be one, as a mirror of the unity of the Father and the Son, and as an effective persuasive to the world that he is the Reconciler. The new sects, as divisive agents, are running counter to the great unitive church trends of our century.

These sects, which are to be described only in general terms, pose at the outset of our inquiry what Kierkegaard would term the "wounding question": Is their intransigence in part due to the failure of the historic Churches, and to the intellectual snobbery and cold-shouldering of *our own attitudes*? If the humility which that question should induce is borne in mind in the ensuing pages, then some of our misty stereotypes of the sects must be shattered in the cold, clear light of accurate information. Indeed, since some of the most respectable denominations of today with world-wide allegiances were "sects" in the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth centuries (as were the Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians), the centrifugal sects may be expected to show an occasional centripetal tendency. To anticipate, this is what is found to be true in the case of the Seventh-Day Adventists and of the Church of the Nazarene. By contrast the Jehovah's Witnesses (Pastor Russellites) are as centrifugal as an errant satellite trying to get away from its parent body as rapidly as possible.

It is also salutary to recall the mobility that is characteristic of the membership of Christian societies, and to remember that a grandfather who is a Pentecostal may have a son who is a Baptist and a grandson who is an Episcopalian. In this sense, then, the sects must be recognized as not only drawing away members from the historic Churches by successful proselytism, but as providing second-generation members for the very Churches from which they dissent.

#### THEIR NUMBERS AND SPREAD

It is difficult to compute the numbers attached to each of the major centrifugal sects; but of the large number of variations on the sectarian

theme there can be no doubt at all. In 1947 it was estimated that there were 74 million persons in the United States affiliated with some religious body, but nine-tenths of these belonged to a dozen major denominations. The remaining tenth, however, was split up among almost 400 sects.

This is an American problem, but it is not confined to America by any means. Its importance in America may be due to several reasons, among them the traditional separation of Church and State, the love of liberty and independence, the rapidly expanding frontiers of a century ago, the right of the individual to interpret the Scriptures in his own language, and liberty of conscience in the ordering of worship and Christian education, which were the consequences of the Protestant Reformation. It is also an African problem, for the government of the Union of South Africa recognizes over a thousand different separatist sects, some of British and many of American extraction, and others of Bantu invention. The problems presented by the sects is therefore one equally of missionary and ecumenical concern. It is so deeply disturbing and bewildering to the newly-fledged Christian and to the inquiring agnostic.

Many of the sects are extremely small and obscure bodies, as bizarre as their names. Such are the Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists of the United States, and the Castor Oil Dead Church and the Donkey Church of the Union of South Africa. Elmer T. Clark computes that eight groups listed as denominations in the U. S. A. have only a single congregation each, and one of these has only thirteen members.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, he adds that thirty-three sects have a membership of over 200,000 each. Sectarianism is a great and growing problem of global relevance.

#### THE HOLINESS TYPE OF SECT

As the different colors of the spectrum shade off into each other, and can only artificially be separated from nature by the observer, so only by abstraction can the centrifugal sects be categorized and classified. Certainly they can be distinguished from such religiously and philosophically syncretistic sects as Theosophy, which deliberately combines Christian and non-Christian elements of thought and practice. G. K. Chesterton hit off its character perfectly in describing it as "religion going to pot." As will be seen, there are significant common characteristics which make the Holiness or Pentecostal sects a family. But it would be a rash man who would attempt to subdivide them as predominantly Perfectionist, or Adventist, or

<sup>1</sup> Clark, E. T., *The Small Sects in America*, Abingdon Press, 1950, p. 14.

Charismatic, or Legalistic. For one and the same sect can show all these traits and more.

It will give concreteness and definition to our considerations if our study is restricted to three of the most widespread sects of the Holiness or Pentecostal type, after which we shall proceed to enumerate the leading characteristics of the entire family. The three sects selected are: The Seventh-Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, and The Assemblies of God.

#### SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

These are chosen first because they are less inclined to wholesale criticism of the Churches from which they dissent than are the two other bodies chosen. Further, in their world-wide spread, and in their employment of medical missionaries, theological training colleges, and educationalists, they bear a close organizational resemblance to the historic Christian Churches. Indeed, they may be a formerly centrifugal sect moving centripetally toward churchmanship—a most significant ecumenical transition.

Seventh-Day Adventism owes its origin to William Miller and Ellen Harmon White. The former, a Baptist farmer, born at Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in 1782, was led by his apocalyptic study of the Scriptures to the firm belief that he knew the exact date of the Second Coming of the Christ. In 1831 he confidently asserted that his researches into the numerology of the books of Daniel and Revelation disclosed that the great event would take place in 1843. As the Parousia did not eventuate then, he admitted a mistake in calculations, but predicted that the following year would see his prophecy proved. History again proving him mistaken, he gave up Adventism.

Despite his complete recantation, one of his followers, Ellen Harmon (White), persisted in believing that his predictions were sound. Her view was that "the Lord did really come in 1844, not to the earth, but to cleanse the sanctuary in Heaven. . . ." <sup>2</sup> She expanded this to mean that Christ had cleansed the sanctuary, begun the final judgment, shutting the door of mercy on sinners. Only those who knew of this "change" could benefit by our Lord's mediation. Others, said Ellen Harmon White, "offer up their useless prayers to the apartment which Jesus left." <sup>3</sup>

The distinctive teaching of the Adventists is fourfold. First, there is the strictly adventist assertion that the Messiah started to complete the

<sup>2</sup> White, E. H., *History of the Advent Message*, p. 410.

<sup>3</sup> White, E. H., *Early Writings*, pp. 114-5.

work of salvation by entering into the Holy of Holies. Until that time, Mrs. White averred, Christ had remained in the outer sanctuary from the time of the Ascension. The *Seventh Day* element in their beliefs consists in the claim that the Jewish Sabbath alone has authority as the Lord's Day, not having been countermanded by the New Testament, and that Christendom's celebration of Sunday is "the Mark of the Beast." Mrs. White defended this particular view on biblical and historical grounds. Finally, she made the irrefutable appeal to a vision of the heavenly sanctuary, in which she saw the cover of the Ark raised by the Messiah and the tables of stone on which the Commandments were engraved. She was, she informs us, "amazed as she saw the Fourth Commandment in the very centre of the ten precepts, with a soft halo of light encircling it."<sup>4</sup> The fourth distinctive belief of the Adventists is in the sleep of the soul after death; the proof-texts are all, significantly enough, taken from the Old Testament.

In earlier days they insisted upon vegetarianism; they also vehemently denounced all participation in politics, and prevented their children from attending State schools. Furthermore, they condemned all religious organizations other than their own. Such perfectionism and political escapism are not infrequently the concomitants of an apocalyptic sect in the first careless rapture of its beginnings. The sloughing off of some of these elements, after a loss of confidence in an early parousia, leads to such sects planning for a long-time future, and thereby resembling the historic denominations. The maturing of the sect leads, significantly, not only to a participation in the concerns of "the world," but also to a slightly more charitable view of other religious denominations and even to occasional cooperation with them. All these indications of maturing are, in fact, being shown by the *Seventh-Day* Adventists.

Here is a centrifugal sect becoming markedly centripetal. Apart from its distinctive doctrines, it is an evangelically orthodox group in its acceptance of the principles of Protestant evangelical theology of the older and more conservative school. Baptizing by immersion, it bears the closest resemblance to conservative Baptist churches. It has a predominantly Congregational type of organization and life. In the United States the Adventists number over 200,000 adherents, and over three times that figure as a world total. This does not, however, exhaust their significance, for excluding many sects with a similar Adventist emphasis, there are several other Adventist sects making this their chief emphasis.

<sup>4</sup> Cited in W. C. Irvine, *Heresies Exposed* (8th edition, 1937), London, p. 115.

## JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES OR RUSSELLITES

These could, indeed, be classed as an adventist sect, but they demand separate treatment on account of their virulent anti-ecclesiasticism, demonstrating this sect to be impenitently centrifugal in character. It has been known variously as "The Millennial Dawn," "The International Bible Students Association," "The Watchtower Organization," and its most famous watchword was "Millions now living will never die." Its present designation was supplied by "Judge" Rutherford in 1931, and is based upon a citation from Isa. 43:10: "Ye are my witnesses, said Jehovah."

Its progenitor was Charles Taze Russell of Alleghany; a member of the local Congregational Church, he had imbibed the heady potions of J. H. Paton, a Second Adventist. Inheriting his father's business acumen, and his wealth, he devoted both to the establishment of a new religious organization in 1884. Its beliefs were disseminated by a magazine, an unending flood of tracts, and a seven-volume series entitled *Studies in the Scriptures*, which is the chief compendium of the beliefs of the Witnesses. Pertinacious tract-sellers, aided by phonograph records, backed by an extremely efficient line in sales talk and irremovable big toes, all part of a vast commercial organization, have spread the writings of the Russellites throughout the world. It is proudly claimed that Russell's *Divine Plan of the Ages*, which expounded his Millennial Dawn doctrine, has sold more copies in thirty-five languages than any other book, the Bible alone excepted.

On Russell's death he was succeeded by an ardent advocate with an iron hand, Rutherford. He it was who added the records and radio propaganda to Russell's tracts. He also developed the efficiency of the organization, with its Directors and the descending scale of workers, dignified with such titles as Religious Servants, Zone Servants, Service Directors, each directly responsible to his superior. At the local level the Service Director organizes the Kingdom Hall in which the company of Witnesses meets, assisted by the Service Committee, which distributes the propaganda, reports all household calls, requires "back calls" where unsuccessful visits have been made, all of which information is entered on printed forms which have to be returned to headquarters. Altogether an admirable example of serving God with the techniques of Mammon.

Its apparently novel Christology is only refurbished heresy. The belief that Christ, though not Divine, is the first of created beings, is fourth-century Arianism, the stalest of heresies. The Witnesses believe, however,

that the human Jesus paid by his death the ransom for sin. Salvation is not by faith, but by imitation. It is believed, contrary to the New Testament evidence, that at the Resurrection Jesus was given a new, a spiritual resurrection body. As Unitarians, they believe that the Holy Spirit is merely the invisible influence of Jehovah.

Except for their materialistic accounts of the Garden of Eden to be re-established at the Second Advent (which reads like a horticultural catalog prepared by an exaggerator), their beliefs about the future life have more to commend them. Refusing to accept traditional orthodoxy's views of heaven and hell, since to them these seem sadistic, they teach that the Second Advent will give a second chance to all mankind. Those who reject the second opportunity will be annihilated instead of being tortured endlessly.

While there is little here with which to quarrel, more serious objections may be offered to their detailed, imaginative, and unbiblical descriptions of the Millennium. Some time before 1984 God's "Great Theocracy" will be established. This, however, has been postponed on several occasions already, like the "positively last appearance" of the wrinkled prima donna. Indeed, so hackneyed is the combination of the literalistic, the heretical, and the positively spiteful in this theology that it might be dubbed "dying prima donna theology."

For counting chickens before they are hatched, and for sheerly materialistic predictions, the Millennial pictures of the Witnesses are unrivaled. The imagery of the Book of Revelation is positively reticent and austere in comparison. Here it is assumed that the deserts will become gardens, and the Witnesses have even calculated how many resurrected persons can be fed on the reconstituted earth. There will be, they say, 1,275 acres for each village of 200 families.<sup>5</sup> If even this land proves insufficient, then lost continents will be raised from ocean beds. This, they say, will give a literal fulfillment to the promise, "There will be no more sea." (Presumably there will be no more rainfall and no more irrigation either.) Even the number of those destined for the heavenly kingdom (as distinct from the regenerated earth) is exactly computed as 144,000.

Such precise speculations spring more from skepticism's wish for reassurance than from faith's quiet certainties. Perhaps the most fitting comment on the products of such overheated and underdisciplined fancies is Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr's: that faith has no interest in either the furniture of heaven or the temperature of hell.

<sup>5</sup> *Riches*, p. 188.

## ASSEMBLIES OF GOD

This is the third example of a centrifugal sect. *The Assemblies of God, General Council*, is the largest Pentecostal sect in the United States. It has a membership of a quarter of a million, and some five thousand local churches. It derives from the Church of God, itself largely the creation of a revivalist, A. J. Tomlinson, who stimulated Pentecostal revivals throughout North America in the first forty years of this century. This charismatic sect runs true to type.

Its chief traits may be summarized as follows. Its adherents believe themselves to be the "true Church" and all other Christians are apostate worldlings. They confidently expect the imminent Second Advent of Christ to snatch them out of this evil world. They believe in the literal inspiration of Holy Writ, and enjoy making from the apocalyptic strain in the Scriptures mysterious oracles the import of which they alone can divine and interpret. Their conduct is restrictively Puritan in contrast to the laxity, indulgence, and vanity of their neighbors.

All these characteristics are shared by all members of the Assemblies of God. Their predominant emphasis, however, is on sanctification. This is known to have begun in a believer by the baptism of the Spirit, as proved by the donation of the gift of tongues. The chief difference between the Assemblies of God and other holiness or perfectionist groups is that, while others teach that the gift of the Spirit is immediate and complete, the Assemblies of God assert that sanctification is progressive. This is very significant, for such gradualism may be the sign of a centripetal tendency, of a growing away from sectarianism toward churchmanship.

## COMMON CHARACTERISTICS

Is it legitimate to generalize about these three kinds of Pentecostal sects in the modern world? Having admitted that there are variations, the theme on which they are variations may fairly be analyzed. There are, to be sure, many striking characteristics which these Perfectionist, Adventist, Pentecostal, Charismatic sects have in common, and it is important to try to account for their growing popularity.

(1) The primary source of all their beliefs and practices is the Bible. They are especially attracted to those passages of a prophetic and, as they imagine, predictive quality, so that the Books of Daniel and of Revelation are their happiest hunting grounds for doctrine. They represent the peril of subjective interpretation of the Scriptures. Nonetheless, this naïve

biblicism has three strong attractions. The first is a strong source of authority and precision in doctrine, as compared with the nebulosity that occasionally characterizes liberal teaching. "The Bible says . . ." (especially when it is believed to be the infallible Word of God) is a talisman that disposes of all arguments and dispels all doubts. Secondly, newer sects, the numbers of which are few, and subject to derision from the older and established denominations, tend to find compensation for their present lowness in a future greatness and prestige described in the apocalyptic sections of Holy Writ. They also find it convenient to apply the descriptions of a painful future state (or, in the case of the Witnesses, destruction) to those with whom they disagree. Thirdly, biblicism brings an ethical legalism into religion, a stiffening of the moral backbone, which in its prohibitions and its rigidly black-and-white outlook proves alluring to uncomplicated minds who see things as "right" or "wrong," never as "the lesser of two evils" or "a conflict of loyalties."

(2) Inevitably such sects are perfectionist and otherworldly in their pietism. Their adherents aim primarily at keeping themselves "unspotted from the world" rather than in "visiting the widows and fatherless in their affliction." In their stern austerity, they despise the expensive clothes, the cosmetics, the wines, the plays, the movies, and the novel-reading of other Christians as sheer vanity, frivolity, and self-indulgence. For them there is no problem of Christian culture, any more than there is a problem of Christian citizenship in social and political life. Christ and culture are, in their view, inevitably antagonistic. Since they believe that the only significant citizenship is in heaven, they ignore their civic rights and responsibilities.

(3) Their central doctrine and practice is sanctification. This is cultivated with a commendable assiduity, by Bible-reading, prayer, and asceticism. Sometimes sanctification is sought in dramatically charismatic ways, as, for example, by the gift of tongues, or in prayer-meetings that continue through the night and are more like Marathon than Emmaus. There is no denying the intensity of the pursuit of holiness in sects of this type.

(4) The charismatic element is more plainly seen in their worship, with a strongly pneumatic character. Emphasis is laid less on the mind than on the sincerity of the heart. Consequently extemporaneous prayer (as contrasted with a formal liturgy), adult baptism (as contrasted with paedobaptism), "testimonies" (often replacing sermons), and the punctuation of the leader's prayer with such devout interruptions as "Hallelujah" or "Praise the Lord" are popular. Other features of this worship are the

singing of hymns with rousing refrains and staccato rhythms loud enough to raise the roof, and the taking of frequent collections in the same service. These uninhibited, often unpremeditated simplicities of the cult contrast pointedly with the elaborate, decorous, planned forms of worship in the historic Churches.

(5) The biblical simplicity, charismatic enthusiasm, ethical perfectionism, and apocalyptic compensationism of the sectarians lead them necessarily to a cutting criticism of conventional churchmanship, varying from mild intolerance to virulent anti-ecclesiasticism. This is their chief centrifugal characteristic, and, it must be admitted, their ugliest feature.

(6) In doctrine, the sectarians intend to be faithfully biblical, but their subjectivism, without the ballast of tradition, leads them into ancient heresies. These often take the form of making other conditions for salvation than those which the primitive Church seemed to consider necessary. It also appears that when they consider the future life (whether envisaged on a transformed earth or in heaven) they cannot remain content with the reverent silences of faith and of the New Testament itself.

(7) In ecclesiastical structure, they are often independent in origin, but develop connectionism as they expand. This is easily explicable, for sects rising in opposition to conventional organizations are a resistance movement, and such almost always adopt the simplest democratic expression of power—one man, one vote. Where they appear to have a hieratic character, this is entirely due to the impress of a founder or leader of the group and is not likely to survive his death.

#### QUALITIES AND DEFECTS

A fair evaluation should attempt to do justice to the merits and defects of these sects. On the credit side of the account, recognition must be made of their intense loyalty to Christ and to their group membership. This is shown in their habits of regular Bible-reading, prayer, witnessing, and generous giving. In their missionary zeal they are intrepid and pertinacious. Their fellowships are warm and cohesive. The piety they foster is deep and also narrow.

It is narrow because it is ignorant of the history of Christianity (this follows from the heresies it unknowingly revives), and it is naïvely critical of almost all developments of modern knowledge, whether scientific or theological. The same narrowness produces uncharitableness to all Christians of other denominations. Its ethical withdrawal from the world might be termed "Puritan," were it not accompanied by an apathy toward politics

and citizenship which the Puritans never knew. The sectarians are interested in the gospel as a personality-changing, but not as a community-transforming factor. Their deep sense of the otherworldly needs to be balanced with more of the this-worldly; their doctrine of the Atonement with an appreciation of the Incarnation; their prophetic-apocalyptic emphasis with a historic-sacramental trend; and their stress on holiness needs supplementing with an equal stress on charity.

#### THE CHALLENGE OF THE SECTS

The importance of considering the sects is not that it should lead to a Pharisaic judgment of our own superiority, but that we should hear what the Spirit is saying to the historic Churches through the medium of the sects.

First, I believe that the Spirit is calling the older Christian communions to recognize that millions of persons are finding sectarianism to be the most satisfying form of Christianity for them. This, admittedly, could be for good or for inadequate reasons. What are the good reasons? Undoubtedly the warmth of fellowship which the sects display is one of them. With almost equal confidence, we may assert that another is the high spiritual and ethical demand the sects make upon their members and the thorough instruction they give them. In comparison, conventional Christians seem almost indistinguishable ethically from decent atheists; it is rarely that they are seen racing along the second mile. A third factor is the homogeneity of the social group of the sectarians. There is a class-cohesion among them, and a real difference between the income brackets to which they belong as downtown Pentecostals and those of affluently suburban Episcopalians or Presbyterians, although the divide may be crossed in two generations.

Among the inadequate reasons for the success of Pentecostalism, we may count the failure of conventional Christianity to attract. Even more significant, however, is the spirit of the age in which we are living, to which the sects are strongly opposed. Where the *Zeitgeist* is one of relativism in belief and standards of behavior, authoritarian forms of religion (whether of the left or of the right) may be expected to flourish. When minds are expected to remain open in most departments of life, it is comforting to close them with confidence in that region which provides the greatest source of solace—religion. Where the menace of the hydrogen bomb threatens the whole of human society, an otherworldly pietism might be expected to abound. Where each ethical demand is a new problem

requiring sensitive balancing of motives and probabilities of the effects of an action, the ethical rule of thumb provided by the ten commandments makes for uncomplicated living.

Other factors which might account for the success of these sects are the segregation practiced by certain European churches, the flight of certain undisciplined and ambitious persons from the older Churches to become founders of new splinter groups; but such personal factors ought not to be considered in detail here.

#### THE ISSUES RAISED

Not the least significant are the issues that the proliferation of the sects thrusts upon the theologians of the historic Christian Churches. Chief among them is the problem of the seat of authority in the Christian religion. Is this located among the experts, or supremely in one expert speaking *ex cathedra*? Or is authority, as the Protestant believes, to be found in the Holy Scriptures as confirmed in the experience of the Church past and present? (If so, then what selective principle in interpreting the Scriptures is to be adopted?) Or, a third alternative, what authority is to be given to the inspired individual, the saint in whom the Holy Spirit dwells? (The Society of Friends has raised this issue, and the charismatic sects raise it again.) The problem of authority or authorities and their priority is central for all Christian communions.

The coming into being of a fourth section of Christendom, the Pentecostal sects and their imitators, raises a new ecumenical problem. Hitherto the reunion of Christendom has been considered largely in terms of crossing the divide between Catholic and Protestant; and Episcopalianism, stressing both Catholic and Reformed elements, as also Lutheranism, have been considered as bridge churches in such a situation. The new alignment might make the Baptists or the Congregationalists more the *via media* between Catholicism and Pentecostalism.

The fact that the Pentecostal sects often take over the derelict buildings of the churches relinquished in downtown areas raises in vivid form the question whether certain Protestant denominations have too readily given up a parish for a suburban conception of ministry. Roman Catholic and Episcopal churches have been conspicuously successful in the parish type of ministry, whereas Congregational, Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches have often moved out with their community to the newer suburbs, losing the continuity that a parish minister maintains in its locality from year to year.

A fascinating and important problem is posed by the Pentecostal sects. It is this: which are centrifugal and which are centripetal? And even more significant: when does a centrifugal sect become centripetal, and why? This question is one of more than academic interest for all interested in promoting ecumenical relationships, that they may be able to encourage centripetal tendencies and increase the comity of churches by reducing the number of sects.

It might be suggested that some signs of centripetal movement may be discerned in the following tendencies. Negatively, the weakening of the criticism of the historic churches appears as charity grows; time and history reduce the impatience that is characteristic of a sect, as do international responsibilities when the sect proliferates. Positively, a greater emphasis on organization and tradition, a desire for an educated ministry (and willingness to use universities and seminaries for the purpose), a concern for Christian citizenship and culture, all imply a constructive coming to terms with the world, a growing toward churchmanship.

Finally, the undogmatic and sensitive churchman will recognize that sectarians are often such because of the accident of birth and the circumstances of their parental religious affiliation. Further, he will gratefully acknowledge that the intensity of the piety of many a sectarian has lived on through his more charitable children in another denomination. He may even go further still and wish that his own communion had the warmth of fellowship, the missionary zeal, the financial liberality, the disciplined piety and perseverance of the Pentecostals. Should he believe this, then he will not only pray for the coming of the Pentecostals into the World Council of Churches; he will go out to meet them as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ went out to meet us all, being prodigals. For the profoundest way of regarding these sects is not as heretics, schismatics, or sectarians, but as sheep seeking an adjacent fold, who hear the voice of the same Shepherd as ourselves.

*From Charles S. Braden*

**A**MONG THE MANY SECTS of Christianity in America, the most aggressive and rapidly growing are those of the Adventist and Pentecostal types. Now Adventism is found to some degree in most of the conservative churches. That is, the majority of conservative-minded Christians believe in the literal second coming of Christ and are divided just as the sectarian Adventists are on the question of pre- or postmillennialism. Many of them regard his coming as imminent. The difference is largely one of emphasis. They believe in it, but they do not make it a matter of primary concern. The so-called Adventist churches do.

Likewise, the Pentecostal experience. Many persons in the larger denominations believe in it, certainly as a phenomenon of the early church, and are tolerant of those who feel that it is a possible present experience, though usually it is no longer experienced in most of their churches. But they do not hold it as of central importance, and certainly do not regard the experience as a normative test of the genuineness of one's faith. It is not assumed to be a natural, universal Christian experience. But in the Pentecostal churches it is. There it is distinctive. It is an experience to be sought after. And those who do not attain to it are likely to suffer from a sense of guilt or frustration. What is wrong with them that the experience does not come to them?

In many cases Adventism and the Pentecostal experience are shared by the same people. Indeed, probably most Pentecostals look almost as confidently toward the second coming as do the Adventists. But the reverse is not true. Some Adventists are not at all Pentecostal in outlook. This is certainly true of the Seventh Day Adventists, and even more so of the most aggressively Adventist of all the groups, Jehovah's Witnesses.

Some of the so-called Holiness and Church of God groups are both Adventist and Pentecostal, yet Adventists and Pentecostals are not all willing to accept Holiness doctrines and practices. So it becomes an almost impossible task to classify the various groups at all accurately. One need only consult the different books dealing with American sects to see how variously it is done.

---

CHARLES S. BRADEN, B.D., Ph.D., D.D., formerly Professor of History and Literature of Religions at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, has more recently served as Visiting Professor of Religion at Scripps College, Claremont, California.

## I

We have said that they seem to be the most aggressive and rapidly growing. What is the evidence? It may be observed that some of the groups do not make any attempt to keep accurate statistics, and often one or another of the sects fails to send a report to the National Council of Churches, the organization which now concerns itself with gathering and publishing church statistics. But the successive Yearbooks do give what figures they are able to collect year after year. Since they lack the authority of government in its census taking, the results are by no means all that could be wished.

The 1953 *Yearbook of the Churches*, commenting on the percentage growth of religious bodies, found that for the year there reported there was an increase of 3.7 per cent over the previous year—which, they observed, was substantially above that of the years before. According to the 1956 volume, the increase was 2.8 per cent. Assuming roughly a 3 per cent increase per year as an average, in ten years the increase would be about 32.25 per cent. Over against this, the Seventh Day Adventists increased slightly over 39 per cent, according to the figures given in the 1945 and 1955 Yearbooks. During the same period the Assemblies of God increased just under 76 per cent, or well over double the average rate, while the Pentecostal Holiness Church registered a growth of 86 per cent.

In order to see these in comparison with the major denominations, we note that the Methodist increase over the same decade was but 13.7 per cent; the Presbyterians in the U. S. A. (the Northern branch) slightly over 22 per cent; the Congregationalists 19.3 per cent; the Episcopalians 14.4 per cent. During the same period the Southern Baptists, which in general outlook are much nearer the groups we are studying, increased just over 46.4 per cent.

It might be argued that the recent swing from liberalism in the conservative direction could account for this; but comparison with other conservative groups still shows these Adventist and Pentecostal groups to be well out ahead. For example, the Church of the Brethren, normally rather conservative, increased by only a little over 5.5 per cent, while the Evangelical and Reformed Church registered slightly over 12.5 per cent gain; and the Reformed Church in America gained a little over 16.8 per cent.

Why, it may be asked, should these churches be growing so much more rapidly than the other churches? Before this can be answered, it is

proper to ask who belong to these groups? Where are they found? What is the nature of their appeal, and what about their leadership?

In the first place, no one general answer will include both the Adventists and the Pentecostals. Among the Adventists, there is a substantial difference. It is doubtful if the Seventh Day Adventists differ in general economic and social level from the average run of membership in the larger popular denominations. On the other hand the Jehovah's Witnesses, the most aggressive and least orthodox of the Adventists, are definitely recruited from the lower income groups. They come as near being the disinherited as any American religious group. Unfortunately they do not furnish statistics to the Yearbook of the churches, as to the number of their members. Accordingly one must infer from other facts which they do publish, any evidence of growth. Fortunately they do make public the numbers of "publishers," or what correspond to ministers in other churches. The number of these by decades beginning in 1918 was 743; 6,040; 25,596; 72,945; and in the next five years, by 1953, it had risen to 139,966. It is probable that this would reflect itself in a like growth in membership. Also each national gathering of the Witnesses seems larger and more enthusiastic than the last.

After writing the above, I found tucked away in an Appendix to Marley Cole's *Jehovah's Witnesses*,<sup>1</sup> in a brief article concerning the President of the Movement, Mr. N. H. Knorr, a table showing the growth of the Witnesses from 1942 to 1953. The membership was in these years, successively, 115,240; 207,552; 456,265; and 519,982. It should be added that this includes the Witnesses, not only in America, but in 143 different countries. This represents an increase of world membership of 353 per cent in eleven years, and abundantly corroborates the guess based on the increase in the number of publishers. A statement in another part of the book (p. 25) declares that the number in North America doubled, that is, increased 100 per cent during these eleven years; that in Asia it multiplied five times; in the Pacific Islands six times; seven times in Europe and Africa; and nearly fifteen times in South America.

Among the Pentecostal bodies it is impossible to speak accurately concerning their economic status. I asked a number of leaders of the groups about this. The response was generally that the movements had in fact begun at the lower economic level, but that this is changing; that there are now substantial numbers of professional and business men among their membership. A general officer of one of the churches said: "Our church

<sup>1</sup> New York: Vantage Press, 1955.

is not made up of any one economic or social group. I would say that it is composed largely of the middle economic group, with a few in the lower and a few in the upper." An officer of another of the groups wrote: "Our churches are largely made up of working people. There are some business men, some from management and the professions, but my own observation is that the great majority are from the farms and the factories."

An officer of the largest group wrote:

Its appeal has been to the same class of people which responded to the ministry of the Lord Jesus during his earthly sojourn, and those who responded to the ministry of John and Charles Wesley in England. . . . As refinements are introduced, people of the upper classes identify themselves with it. Many of our churches have in their membership persons in the professional classes, teachers, doctors, lawyers, etc.

An officer of still another church writes:

Our folks are of moderate means. An approximate 25 per cent are business men and their families. Another 60 per cent would be of the skilled crafts, such as carpenters, plumbers, electricians and their families; also office workers. The other fifteen per cent could be divided between the lower and higher income groups, as there are a number of rather well-to-do people among those who are Pentecostal in experience and doctrine.

No estimate of the relative number of rural and urban churches was available in any of the churches with which correspondence was attempted. The last United States religious census showed that 66.9 per cent of nine Pentecostal groups were at that time urban. Some branches ran as high as 92 per cent urban, though a few were under 50 per cent urban. The Holiness groups were more largely rural, but of their whole number 63.8 per cent were urban also.

The churches are still usually located in other than the restricted areas of the towns and cities, still largely on the "other side of the tracks." But their churches are becoming more churchly, some are quite modernistic, and the appointments are generally improving. This is a natural accompaniment of the general rise in wages and living standards the country over, but probably also due to the fact that their faith makes them honest, dependable, and willing to work; and since it also prevents them from spending their substance on drink or in gambling, or other worldly pleasures, they become more prosperous with the passing years. To what extent they lose members as they do become more prosperous and are tempted by the worldliness of their surroundings cannot be determined. Do they hold their second-generation members? Their leaders seem to think that they do, reasonably well. I know of no factual study in this area, though one would be very interesting. In the churches I have attended the younger

element does not seem to be conspicuously less than in the larger denominational churches.

## II

As to why they are growing more rapidly than other churches, there seem to be several reasons.

1. First, I think they work harder at the task of winning people than do the members of the "regular" churches. They are most of them ardent propagandists, and have a sense of compulsion upon them which people and leaders of other churches seem to lack. This is of course inherent in their doctrine. They, at least the Adventists (and we have already remarked that most Pentecostals are also Adventist to a considerable degree), are under a sense of urgency to call men to repent. Time is running out. The end of the world is near. The day of judgment is near at hand. The urge to snatch some brands from the burning is a natural corollary, if it is taken at all seriously. It drives men to active evangelistic effort on behalf of the lost. Personal evangelism is the accepted method—along with the corporate revivalistic emphasis. Such personal concern may seem to sophisticated people an invasion of their privacy, and they resent it. The answer here is that the appeal made by the individual and groups is not generally to the sophisticated, hence it is often successful. Isn't it just possible that lonely folk, hard pressed by life, might see in this personal concern not a cause of resentment but an expression of sincere friendly interest to which they might gladly respond?

We may, then, I think, put down as one reason that they work harder and more persistently at the job of winning others to their faith than do the members of most of the larger denominational churches. These are much more likely to rest their case with the minister and the leaders in the Sunday School and Young People's Societies who make themselves responsible for the Christian nurture, outside the home, of the oncoming generations. Visitation evangelism has in more recent years become a technique of the larger churches which, while productive of some growth of the church, has more generally laid emphasis on joining the church, rather than an acceptance of Christ, or conversion, as these sectarian groups are more likely to put it.

2. A second and closely related reason is that the members of these churches are taught to witness for their faith. They are expected to do it both publicly and privately. To a considerable degree their "personal work" consists simply in witnessing to what God in Christ has done for them. And that, when sincerely done, is the most effective personal work

that an individual can perform. It was the primary method by which the earliest Christians were won. Andrew found Simon Peter his brother and said to him, "We have found the Messiah," and brought him to Jesus. Modern advertising knows this. They pay exceedingly well our movie actors, our socialites, or our "men of distinction," to declare publicly that they smoke a certain brand of cigarette or use a given face cream or drink a well-known brand of whisky. These people are witnessing—often quite insincerely—to the benefits they derive from a given product. The fact that they do it for a price doesn't seem to make any difference. It still seems to be effective. Otherwise canny advertisers who pay huge sums to check on the effectiveness of their advertising would not continue to employ such witnesses. Evidently it pays off.

The best advertising for a book is the enthusiastic report of one who has read it; of a new food, the witness of one who has eaten it and liked it. It is not greatly different in the world of religion. The honest straightforward personal witness of one who has accepted it and lives by it successfully, who finds in it the clue to victorious living, is the most effective means of commanding it to others. The Christian Science Church recognizes this in its midweek testimony meeting. There is a good deal of evidence that this is a major source of their growth in membership. At this point none exceed Jehovah's Witnesses in zeal. They witness tirelessly on street corners, from house to house, in crowded places. Sometimes the witness is badly given. Sometimes it is resented by those to whom it is offered, but for many it is the beginning of an interest which leads to inquiry, and often to acceptance of that to which the witness has testified.

Most Christians of the larger denominations will say, and rightly, that the testimony of a good life is a real witness, and perhaps the most effective. But the fact is that there is so little in the lives of average Christians to distinguish them from those who make no Christian profession, that it has little weight in influencing people to accept their faith. But even where it is distinctive, it can be of the greatest value now and then to declare the source of those graces which men find attractive in them. The simple declaration, sincerely made, "This God has done for me, this Christ means to me," has often been a powerful stimulus to others to seek to find that same source of peace and power. The Adventist-Pentecostal people know this. And they act on it with a patient persistence which is one of the explanations of their more rapid growth in membership in their churches.

3. A third reason is the kind of a world we live in. Never was there more evidence of the imminence of the end of the world. The constant

threat of war hangs over us, global war, which could result in the destruction of our very civilization itself. In the light of this the language of apocalypse no longer strikes people as fanciful and unreal. In the old days, before 1914, the bursting on the world of the First World War, it must have seemed rather unrealistic to talk in terms of the battle of Armageddon. How could anyone possibly imagine this best of all possible worlds suddenly coming to an end?

Two world wars in a generation have made it less fantastic, and the elaboration of techniques of control of atomic power opens up unlimited possibilities of destructiveness. The poor little A-bomb which destroyed some one hundred and fifty thousand lives in a mere instant, has been utterly outmoded and dwarfed by the H-bomb with the destructive power of fifty million tons of TNT. And guided missiles with incredible speeds are being perfected to send these atomic messengers of death on their way from one continent to another. Just over the horizon, already on drawing boards, are space ships and cobalt bombs whose power of destruction is almost beyond imagining.

No wonder these old apocalyptic fears and hopes come alive. It isn't just crackpot preachers who now announce the threatened end of the age, but slick paper magazine writers, and world-famous scientists. They do not always have the apocalyptic *hope*, but they do not hesitate to voice the apocalyptic *fears* of the end of the age.

Is it strange, therefore, that many are affected by the preaching of the apocalyptic hope? Fear there is, a plenty. But what is the way out? Is it not in the world that lies beyond the world of our present fears? They see no hope here. "No place to hide," wrote a popular journalist who was not trying to preach to anyone. People everywhere were talking about it. Some were building supposedly bomb-proof shelters in their back yards. One man was creating for himself and his followers a hideout in the mountains of a Western state, too far away from any important city to make it pay to drop a bomb on it. But that was before there loomed upon the horizon the terrible fall-out threat, and the other horrors of the more recent years. Literally there is now no place to hide, *here*.

All this gives tremendous point to the preaching of the Adventists. I suspect it helps appreciably to account for their more rapid rate of growth.

4. I have elsewhere suggested another possible reason for this growth. Though there has been a powerful reactionary movement against the older liberalism in theology, and the somewhat tentative way in which the liberals hold their religious convictions, there is still a great deal of uncer-

tainty and insecurity occasioned by the scientific developments of our times. Religious belief has been challenged deeply, and a lot is appearing in the popular magazines and even the newspapers (formerly it was only found in the highbrow publications), which tends to throw doubt upon some of the older ideas, particularly about the Bible. The recent publication of information about the Dead Sea Scrolls seems to have raised questions in the minds of many about the sources of Jesus' ideas.

In the midst of a time like this there is a desire for assurance and certainty. How does one get certainty? His authorities, either the church or the Bible, are under fire. How can he know he is on the right track? Today as always, I think, experienced truth is more cogent than any other. If to my belief in Christ and God I can bring the reinforcement of personal experience, it is confirmed and strengthened as in no other way. These groups are strong in their emphasis on religious experience. The Pentecostal-Holiness churches lay great stress on the personal experience of receiving the baptism of the Holy Spirit, signalized in the Pentecostal churches by a profound and moving experience. It may take a mild form or it may eventuate in speaking in tongues, in dancing, in shouting, in rolling upon the floor, in spasmodic jerking of the muscles, or even falling into a deep trance, or other ecstatic experience. This is so powerful, so overwhelming, that it seems unmistakably to confirm the faith. One is not easily argued out of a faith which has brought such spectacular results in personal experience.

Those also who do not express themselves in such violent motor forms feel nevertheless that God has blessed them and are confirmed in their religious faith. Thus comes a feeling of certainty and assurance which they crave. They can say with Paul, "I know in whom I have believed." This, it need hardly be said, does not guarantee that the peculiar theological beliefs they hold are necessarily true, but they are themselves satisfied that they are. They no longer feel any doubt or hesitation about them. And their conviction and certainty is an important factor in the effectiveness of their witness. Their very sincerity and sureness lead people to listen to them. Conviction is likely to beget conviction.

5. An element of appeal in these churches, particularly the Pentecostal-Holiness groups, less so in the Adventist groups, is the freedom of emotional expression permitted in the churches. I doubt if the Seventh Day Adventists are any more emotional than the average conservative churches; and the Jehovah's Witnesses' meetings are as devoid of emotional content as any I have ever visited. The chief feature is the study of the

Bible and the literature of the movement, resembling more an old-fashioned Bible class where references were looked up, read and commented on by the members of the group.

But the Pentecostal-Holiness adventists give free reign to emotion. Their services are extremely informal, indeed they seem sometimes to be very noisy and disorderly to those accustomed to the formal worship services of the larger denominations. If one wishes to shout, he does so. He can say "Amen" or "Hallelujah" or "Bless the Lord" whenever he feels like it. He can pray aloud when the minister leads in prayer. If he is caught up by the spirit into an ecstasy and wants to jump or dance, he does so. Nobody pays any attention to him. To orderly souls, steeped in a formal tradition of worship, this is shocking. To highly educated people the control of the emotions seems very important. One may feel very deeply, but he may not express it externally or publicly. It just isn't done among them.

I have for many years been convinced that individual temperament to a very large degree determines the response to a given type of religious experience. Of course we are largely determined in our earlier religious habits by our social environment. We are Catholic or Protestant largely because of the family into which we are born. Also we are Methodist or Presbyterian or Episcopal or Pentecostal for the same reason. But as we mature, as we begin to make our own choices and elect our own way of life, many of us who are Protestant become Catholic, or if Catholic become Protestant—there is about an even give and take between the two—because we find something in the other faith, as we become acquainted with it, which attracts us. Some love the pageantry and drama of Catholicism, some are repelled by it. Some are attracted by the austere beauty of a Quaker meetinghouse and the quiet afforded there for a deep inner experience. Some find formal services boring and cold, and are attracted to the bright, hopeful, and (if you will) noisy and informal type of worship found in the Pentecostal type of service. Here something active is going on. One sings at the top of his voice. He joins in audible prayer, he claps his hands, he shouts, he jumps, he rolls. Here is the opportunity for full emotional expression. So much of life requires that he keep himself and his feelings firmly under control. He must not act as he feels. Always he is inhibiting the expression of what he feels. But his church offers him full opportunity to express himself as he wishes.

I suspect that a great many of us are so constituted that now and then we like to let ourselves go. The more highly educated we become, the

greater the likelihood that we will refrain from doing so, particularly in the area of religion. Maybe this is the reason why the mass sporting events such as baseball and football games draw such huge crowds of people. It is still good form to let oneself go at a game. To some extent this is true also of great political rallies, though one gets the impression that much of the emotional overflow is definitely synthetic, something worked up rather artificially. Even so, men seem to enjoy it, and women also, who ordinarily are extremely sedate in their behavior. Well, here in these churches there is opportunity at any time to let oneself go. This appeals to a great many people drawn from the older established denominations which have grown formal and cold in their worship. For many, probably a substantial percentage of the members of these groups, come from the large denominations, rather than from the general unchurched populace.

### III

What is the educational level of these churches and their ministers? I was unable to get a statistical statement concerning this, but my distinct impression is that the majority are not of the highly educated group in American life. I did discover a definite interest in education among the churches. Most of the sects maintain at least some schools in which they attempt, while furnishing a general education, to maintain the general doctrines and practices of the churches which support them. Some are at the junior college level, some are four-year colleges. By no means all of them are as yet accredited, but progress is being made in that direction, and there seems to be a definite intention to have them accredited eventually. Strong emphasis is put upon courses in religion and Bible, and I gather that a number of their preachers get their education and training in these schools. None of the churches with which I established contact, all of them of the Pentecostal-Holiness groups, had any graduate Seminary. But some do maintain Bible Institutes which train both ministers and lay workers, both men and women. Some ministers have had Seminary training, but have had to go outside of their denominational schools to secure it.

One cannot help wondering what will be the eventual result of the improving economic level of the people in these churches. Almost inevitably there will be a rise in the educational level. When their young people begin to enter the professions, and the world of business management, the need for higher education will become imperative, and they will go to graduate schools not of their own faith. As this happens, it is inevitable also that the demand for a more highly educated and trained ministry will be made.

And as ministers go on to Seminaries, especially unless they be Seminaries which sustain more or less the doctrinal position held by these churches, a liberalizing tendency is likely to appear. This definitely has happened in the Nazarene Church, which has emphasized Holiness especially. Not that it does not do so still, but less exclusively so. And their worship practices tend more and more to approach those of the ordinary conservative Protestant churches.

As just one slight indication of such a tendency in these Pentecostal churches, I asked a number of general officers whether there are any churches which now have robed choirs. Replies indicate that a few are beginning this practice. Is there any significance in this? I think there is. It is the beginning of a more formalized type of worship. It certainly is not inconceivable that one might experience a religious ecstasy while wearing a robe. I have seen extreme emotionalism among followers of Father Divine who were wearing, if not robes, at least special distinguishing uniforms. But the chances are, I suggest, strongly against it. An earmark of their worship generally is complete informality—utter individual freedom of expression. But to put on a robe just like that worn by a score or more of other people is to sacrifice something of individual freedom. Once this is started, where does it stop?

At this point in the preparation of my article, I went one Sunday evening to a service in an Assembly of God Church. I had attended the morning service there and found it very little different from an ordinary Methodist small town church service of my own childhood and youth—slightly more informal, perhaps, but not much. In the evening I rather looked for something different. Instead I found a robed choir, which I hasten to add was special that night, for it was made up of the singing group of a nearby Bible Institute of the denomination. They wore purple robes with bright red collars, and made an extremely colorful and attractive choir. They sang several special numbers, some of them of the old revivalistic type. I recall "Higher Ground," which was sung in a clearly jazzed version. There was a regular revivalistic sermon, and then the altar call. The preacher asked the choir, which had gone to sit in the audience during the sermon, to return to the platform and sing. This they did. They sang *a cappella* an old gospel song, while the pastor gave the impassioned invitation to sinners to come to the altar. None came!

There was something incongruous about it all. The elegantly robed choir—ranged in regular concert formation on the platform—added an element of formality which just didn't seem to fit. I could not help won-

dering if it were this that hindered sinners from responding, though my real guess is that the sinners were not there that night. Everybody present seemed already to be of the faith. Then came an invitation to those who wanted a deeper work of grace to come forward, and many came. Some or most of the purple-robed singers broke ranks and joined those praying at the altar. But nothing striking happened. There was some praying aloud. A few Amens sounded, but very little more. The Spirit seized no one mightily. No one spoke in tongues. Gradually those at the mourners' bench arose from their knees and left the church, speaking pleasantly to friends at the door. There was not even a dismissal or benediction. I would have been greatly surprised to witness an outbreak of fervid emotionalism under the circumstances.

I asked my informants also if any of their ministers wore gowns in the pulpit. The answer was no, in every case. Evidently the movement toward more formality, if one exists, has not gone that far. But these churches are not very old. The Adventists go back for perhaps a century or more, but the modern upsurge of the Pentecostal churches is comparatively recent. Pentecostal writers generally date it from a meeting of ministers and Christian workers at Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas, in 1900, whence it spread through Texas to Los Angeles, where it centered in 1906 in a building on Azusa Street. From there ministers and workers went out to spread it all over America and the mission fields of the world.

It was inevitable that, given the extreme freedom of individual experience and its expression, the movement should divide again and again, until it had split into a considerable number of sects. It still divides and will probably continue to do so; but there does seem to be something of a reintegrative tendency among them, which may result in a flowing together of some of the separate branches. This has already happened in the case of the United Pentecostal Church.

The store front meeting places, so often used in the early days, have given way to special buildings. The earlier of these were more on the order of evangelistic tabernacles than churches, but the recent buildings tend to be more like the typical churches of other denominations. Largely functional in design, rather than ecclesiastical, they are still primarily meeting places, lacking usually, though not always, the stained glass windows and the dimly lit interiors. Often, though not always, they still tend to use either movable chairs or fixed opera-type chairs, rather than pews. The pulpit occupies the center of the platform, the choir is usually behind the minister, and behind this there is often a baptistry, with a painting of the

Jordan river background against which the baptism of members by immersion may be seen.

I have before me as I write the catalogue of the publishing house of the Assemblies of God, one of the most sumptuously printed catalogues I have ever seen. The outside cover has a beautiful picture of a large brick church of pure Georgian style with white pillars supporting the noble portico, set in the midst of lovely trees. It is a church that would grace any New England landscape. One church officer writes proudly of their beautiful new churches. How long, one wonders, will it be before these churches will begin their move to the "other side of the tracks." Or have they already begun?

From Charles W. Ranson

UNDER THE ENGAGING title "Caribbean Holiday," an article appeared in the *Christian Century* last August, from the pen of the President of Union Theological Seminary in New York. Dr. Van Dusen described as the "principal discovery (not altogether new)" of his Caribbean journey, the outreach and influence of the newer Christian "sects"—"that whole vast complex of groups of Christian allegiance usually bearing in their titles the designation 'Adventist' or 'Pentecostal' or 'Holiness' or simply 'Church of God' or 'Church of Christ.'"<sup>1</sup>

The Caribbean area and the countries of Latin America have attracted large numbers of missionaries from these groups and have provided an unusually fertile soil for their message and for the growth of indigenous communities inspired by a similar faith and fervor. But, as Dr. Van Dusen clearly recognizes, the missionary outreach of these newer sects is world-wide in its scope. Their missionaries are to be found in considerable numbers throughout Asia, Africa, and the South West Pacific. They represent a new factor in the modern missionary situation. Indeed, Dr. Van Dusen suggests that "When historians of the future come to assess the most significant development in Christendom in the first half of the 20th century, they will fasten on the ecumenical movement . . . but next to this they will decide that by all odds the most important fact in the Christian history of our times was a *New Reformation*, the emergence of a new, third major type and branch of Christendom, alongside of and not incommensurable with Roman Catholicism and historic Protestantism, in many respects startlingly analogous to the most vital and dynamic expressions of the 16th century Reformation which parented what is today the largest single element within ecumenical Protestantism."<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Horton Davies, with a slight variation of ecumenical arithmetic, states in his contribution to this symposium that these Christian sects "bid fair to constitute a fourth part of the Christian world—the other three segments being Roman Catholicism, Orthodoxy and Protestantism."

These notes are not primarily concerned with historical prognostica-

<sup>1</sup> *The Christian Century*, Aug. 17, 1955, p. 947.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 948.

---

CHARLES WESLEY RANSON, B.Litt. (Oxon), D.Theol. (Kiel), is the General Secretary of the International Missionary Council. He is a Minister of The Methodist Church in Ireland, served for 16 years in India and now has his headquarters in New York. He writes now on the missionary outreach of "The Sects."

tion (however tempting such an exercise may be) nor with theological evaluation (important as that is), but with a limited attempt at factual reporting, an effort to estimate the reaction of the younger churches to the activities of the newer "sects" and a brief comment on some implications for missionary policy.

This is a field in which facts are hard to come by. Of the three major groups which Dr. Davies describes, precise information is not available regarding the missionary activities of Jehovah's Witnesses, while a good deal is known of the resources and activities of the Seventh Day Adventists and the Assemblies of God. One reason for this is that Jehovah's Witnesses are "impenitently centrifugal," in both doctrine and practice, while the other two groups are doctrinally closer to the main stream of Christian orthodoxy, and not wholly averse from the idea of missionary cooperation. Both the Seventh Day Adventists and the Assemblies of God (the largest of the Pentecostal groups) maintain consultative relations with the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of Churches in the United States of America; and the Assemblies of God are members of certain other constituent councils of the International Missionary Council.

The problem of sectarianism and Christian missions is almost infinitely complex, and the situation created by the "sects" and by the spirit of sectarianism is, at many points, wildly confused. A comprehensive treatment of it would demand more detailed factual information than is, at present, available and would require more space than this brief article affords. It has seemed wise, therefore, to place strict limitations on the scope of this essay, to exclude any attempt to deal with aspects of the total problem on which the writer has not had access to reliable information, and to recognize frankly that this leaves some of the most acute expressions of sectarianism outside our present purview.

#### CHANGING COMPOSITION OF THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY FORCE

A measure of the significance of the "sects" as a *new* factor in the missionary situation may be seen in the changing composition of the foreign missionary forces of the non-Roman churches. Throughout the nineteenth century, non-Roman missionaries were drawn almost entirely from the main branches of "historic Protestantism." Hudson Taylor founded the interdenominational China Inland Mission in 1865. But the missionaries of this Society were recruited mainly, if not exclusively, from the historic evangelical traditions. The Plymouth Brethren were also active in missionary work in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. Though

they owed their origin partly to a protest against what they regarded as the excessive formalism of the Church of England and partly to dissatisfaction with sectarian divisions, their narrow theological position drove them to a rigid separatism in their attitude to other missions and missionaries. Despite such exceptions, the missionary work of the non-Roman churches remained preponderantly in the hands of missionaries sent out by the "historic" Protestant churches throughout the first two decades of the present century.

The pullulation of new sects, particularly in the U. S. A., and the great increase in interdenominational "faith" missions, on the model of the China Inland Mission—both in Europe and North America—have had a steadily increasing effect on the composition of the foreign missionary force over the past thirty years. Since 1945, when the Second World War ended, the volume and tempo of the missionary activity of the newer sects have increased so greatly that there is hardly a country in Asia, Africa, or Latin America where their missionaries are not to be found in considerable numbers. A few random examples will suffice to illustrate the effect of this upon the composition of the foreign missionary force. It is reliably estimated that the Pentecostal group in Sweden has a larger number of missionaries "in the field" than all the other churches in Sweden combined. In Japan, five years ago, the number of foreign missionaries attached to small sectarian groups or operating through non-cooperating interdenominational missions was greater than the total missionary force working with the Kyodan (United Church), the Anglican, Lutheran, and other churches associated with the National Christian Council. In Brazil, where it is claimed that evangelical bodies are growing more rapidly than in any other part of the world, some of the most aggressive and successful foreign missionary groups will have nothing to do with the *Confederacio Evangelica do Brasil*, the cooperative agency of the "historic" Protestant Churches.

Though the problem of sectarian foreign missions is far from being exclusively American in origin, the United States has played, and continues to play, a predominant role in creating it and extending its boundaries. This may be attributed both to the proliferation of new sects in the United States and to the large resources at their command to enable them to give practical expression to their missionary zeal. A more detailed examination of the expansion of American foreign missionary activity in recent years and of the distribution of the American (Protestant) missionary force will throw interesting light on the place of the "sects" in the total enterprise.

Thanks to the careful work of the Missionary Research Library in New York, reliable data are available on the missionary outreach of those "sects" (the vast majority) which originate in North America.

In 1925, Canadian and United States agencies had an estimated total of 13,555 missionaries in service. By 1936, the effects of the financial depression may be seen in the reduction of this number to 11,151. The war years witnessed a further reduction—"probably to below the 8,000 level."

Numbers rose swiftly at the end of the war. The Missionary Research Library figures for 1950 showed an increase to over 15,000. By 1952 this figure had risen to 18,576 missionaries from the U. S. A. and Canada; and in 1953 it was estimated that the total had reached the 20,000 mark. It should be noted that this rapid expansion of foreign missionaries took place during a period when the missionary force was in process of gradual withdrawal from China—historically one of the largest fields of American missionary endeavor. Though precise figures are not available for the two years since 1953, there is no reason to assume that the tide of increase in foreign missionary personnel has ceased to flow, despite the efforts of the Government of India and the authorities in certain other Asian countries to impose administrative restraints upon the free entry of foreign missionaries.

It is impossible to distinguish with accuracy and in detail the numbers of missionaries in this total force, who represent the newer sects. But an approximate estimate was made by Dr. R. Pierce Beaver in 1954 (based on the 1953 figures) of the distribution of North American missionary associations, which offers a useful clue to the division of forces as between "historic Protestantism" on the one hand, and the newer sects and the interdenominational faith missions, on the other. Dr. Beaver estimated that only 50 per cent of the 1953 missionary force of approximately 20,000 were in the service of bodies associated with the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. The Division of Foreign Missions includes in its membership the main branches of "historic Protestantism," with the important exception of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. But it also includes within its fellowship—though in a consultative relationship—the Seventh Day Adventists (who operate one of the largest missionary budgets in the Division) and the Assemblies of God (the largest of the groups usually designated Pentecostal). It also has a number of the smaller and

newer denominational and interdenominational missionary agencies in its membership.

It would thus appear that considerably less than half of the total Protestant missionary force from North America today is sent overseas by the churches of historic Protestantism.

Dr. Beaver estimated that in 1953 (allowing 50 per cent for the Division of Foreign Missions) 21 per cent of the missionaries belonged to boards associated with the Interdenominational Foreign Missions Association, 15 per cent with boards of the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association, and 14 per cent with other boards and societies.

These figures, general as they are, are sufficient to give some indication of the change which has taken place in the ecclesiastical complexion of the non-Roman foreign missionary force of North America during the last three or four decades. We have already noted a similar trend in Sweden. But it is also important to note that in other "sending" countries of Europe and Australasia the missionary outreach of the "sects," as such, has been on a much smaller and less dramatic scale. The general tendency in these countries has been in the direction of a gradual reduction of the missionary forces of the historic churches, while at the same time there has been, in certain countries (e.g., Great Britain), a sharp rise in recruitment for interdenominational missionary activity. This steady diminution of the missionary personnel of the older societies in Europe has contributed to the formidable proportional increase in sectarian and nondenominational missionaries in the world as a whole.

#### THE EFFECT ON THE YOUNGER CHURCHES

The emergence of the younger churches has had a powerful influence upon the policies of the older missionary societies. It is nearly a century since Henry Venn of the Church Missionary Society wrote:

Regarding the ultimate object of a mission, viewed under its ecclesiastical result, to be the settlement of a native church under native pastors upon a self-supporting system, it should be borne in mind that the progress of a Mission mainly depends upon the training up and the location of native pastors; and that as it has been happily expressed, the "*euthanasia* of a mission" takes place when a missionary, surrounded by well-trained native congregations under native pastors, is able to resign all pastoral work into their hands, and gradually relax his superintendency over the pastors themselves, till it insensibly ceases; and so the mission passes into a settled Christian community. Then the missionary and all missionary agency should be transferred to the "regions beyond."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Stock: *History of the Church Missionary Society*, Vol. II, p. 415.

The process of devolution from Mission to Church has governed the thought and the policies of the majority of responsible missionary agencies in recent decades. The activities of the established mission boards have been determined in the light of the fact that what Venn calls "settled Christian communities" have come into existence in most of the former mission fields. The nurture of the indigenous church as the instrument of mission is seen as a primary goal. The recognition of the responsibility of the indigenous church for evangelism influences at almost every point the decisions and the methods of mission boards. Missionaries are increasingly sent out on the invitation of the church in the field, and not merely by decision of the "sending" board. They work as servants of the church in the lands to which they go, and are in many cases appointed to their local stations by decision of that church. New developments in missionary activity are undertaken in close consultation and active partnership between the "foreign" mission and the "younger" church. The world mission is conceived as a partnership in obedience between younger and older churches, with the younger churches increasingly regarded as the senior partners within their own territories.

The missionary methods of the newer "sects" present a sharp contrast to all this. The *foreign* missionary rather than the indigenous church is, in practice, the spearhead of their outreach and the focal point of their strategy, even though in some cases they talk about "indigenous church principles."

In an address, marked by clear-sightedness and candor, a representative of one of the small fundamentalist missions recently called attention to this fact and to some of its implications.<sup>4</sup> He pointed out that the "fundamentalist missionary movement" which has developed "relatively late in the day of world missions" has been characterized by "almost endless multiplication of organizations and agencies and spectacular growth of societies." He claimed that the missionary activity of these new agencies has been governed by two principles: the sending-out of foreign missionaries and an emphasis upon "the indigenous church principle." He then proceeded to question the consistency of these two principles and to imply that, in practice, the foreign missionary drive had partially nullified the "indigenous principle."

Our movement [he said] has been carried forward chiefly on the stress of sending out foreign missionaries. The cry has been for more missionaries and more support for foreign missionaries. Promotionally speaking, no other appeal has been

<sup>4</sup> Missionary Research Library: *Occasional Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 13, Nov. 12, 1954.

so effective—churches have been encouraged to support their own missionaries and have gloriéd in the numbers of fully or partially supported individuals on their rosters.

This line of appeal is not confined to the newer “sects” or the smaller fundamentalist societies. But in the older denominational societies there has generally been a sharper awareness of the indigenous church and a more consistent attempt to take seriously the necessity for real partnership. The spokesman of the fundamentalist missions comments frankly on this.

The number of foreign missionaries serving under the principal denominational boards is much smaller proportionately than under our evangelical (*sic*) agencies; but . . . generally speaking, with some outstanding exceptions, the number of their communicants and national workers is much higher than ours. . . . By and large the denominational boards are characterized by fewer foreign workers and larger established churches, whereas ours are characterized by large missionary staffs and smaller church bodies.

The tendency of the newer “sects” and the nondenominational and fundamentalist groups has been to recruit missionaries and send them out, without regard either to the existence of indigenous churches or to the traditions of missionary comity in the countries to which they go. One result of this has been an increasing sensitiveness on the part of governments, both in the new independent states of Asia and in certain colonial territories in Africa, regarding the activities of foreign missionaries. Another result has been the creation of a mood of “alarm” and despondency among the younger churches.

There is no doubt that the articulate leaders of the established younger churches view with dismay the widening activity of the sects. They have a lively concern for Christian unity, are often sharply critical of the heritage of denominational divisions which the historic churches have bequeathed to the churches of Asia and Africa, and in many countries they are striving strenuously for the recovery of the visible unity of the Church. In Asia, especially, the movement for church union has made notable progress. There are united churches, of varying degrees of comprehensiveness, in Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, and South India. Union negotiations are in process in a number of countries and are at an advanced stage in Ceylon, North India and Pakistan, and in Iran. Almost everywhere a high degree of cooperation among the established churches has been achieved. It is not surprising that the younger churches should feel an acute concern as they see new and aggressive forms of sectarianism introduced to their countries from the “Christian West.”

This concern is accentuated by the methods of the “sects,” which appear, in many cases, to concentrate their activities upon established Chris-

tian communities rather than the unevangelized masses. One method which is widely employed by sectarian missionary agencies is the establishment of Bible Schools or training centers for indigenous Christians. A new mission, entering a country in which it has no ecclesiastical connections with the indigenous church, will proceed to set up a training school, to which it attracts students from the established churches by the offer of generous scholarships. The instruction offered tends to be polemical and divisive, and the obvious intention is to provide a supply of trained workers who will either engage in evangelism among non-Christians or seek to introduce "sound" (i.e., fundamentalist or sectarian) doctrine among the existing churches. There has been a proliferation of such institutions in most younger church areas in the decade since the end of the Second World War. There is not, as yet, much reliable evidence as to what happens to the students trained in them. But there is some reason to believe that many of them seek to form separatist groups in the existing Christian communities and that few of them undertake pioneer evangelism in hitherto unevangelized areas.

Responsible younger church leaders express their disquiet and confess their helplessness in the face of this development. A discerning visitor who has recently been traveling in Asia and has had some opportunity to observe this sectarian Bible School movement has described it as "American fundamentalism's last stand." This may not be the last word on this complicated question, but it is undoubtedly true that sectarian fundamentalism has found fresh fields to conquer in the former mission fields of the world and is pouring substantial resources into the effort of conquest. The fact that many of those who support and engage in this activity are deeply in earnest only heightens the tragic element in the situation. For it *is* tragic that young and often immature churches, striving to express their unity in Christ in the face of massive non-Christian resistance, should, at this moment, be exposed to invasion by a new and irrelevant sectarianism—often more virulently divisive than anything they have known before.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR MISSIONARY STRATEGY

The task of achieving unity in mission has already been gravely complicated and is likely to be seriously retarded by the missionary outreach of the "sects." There is a tendency on the part of the younger churches and the older missionary agencies, which are committed to cooperation, merely to deplore that which they cannot amend, to resign themselves helplessly to the situation and get on with their own pressing tasks. But

to assume a posture of pained detachment is, I am convinced, a serious error. There are both lessons to be learned and things to be done in the situation created by the vigorous missionary outthrust of the new "sects."

Reference has been made to the fact that the missionary activity of many of the new sectarian groups is directed to established Christian communities. But this is not the whole story. Some of these agencies are giving themselves with zeal and courage to pioneer work in hitherto unevangelized areas. The older missionary societies and the established younger churches must seek to learn what the Spirit is saying to the churches in this movement. They must ask themselves whether they are fulfilling, as they ought, their central calling to preach the gospel to every creature, whether they are reaching out to the "regions beyond," or whether they are, in fact, largely immobilized in "settled Christian communities," operating within a framework of interchurch aid in which the accent upon mission has been muted, and concern for the unfinished evangelistic task dulled by preoccupation with Christian relationships. The pioneering zeal of some of the new missionary movements poses such searching questions to the older denominational agencies.

We have quoted Henry Venn as a classical exponent of the missionary policy which has influenced most powerfully the historic missionary movement. There has been a serious and widespread effort to give effect to the ideal of the "euthanasia of the mission" as it merges into the settled Christian community. There has been a widespread failure to take seriously and to apply in practice the corollary of the euthanasia theory as Venn expounded it: *"Then the missionary and all missionary agency should be transferred to the 'regions beyond.'"*

The rediscovery of the Church in missionary theology, the recognition of the centrality of the Church in missionary policy, and the emergence of the Younger Churches as a major fact in the missionary situation represent developments of the first importance. They have added a new dimension to missionary thought and imported a richer and truer meaning to the conception of the missionary obligation of the Church. The world mission is the task of the Church universal. Yet all too often such phrases become part of a new ecumenical folklore which obscures and confuses the realities of the missionary situation.

One of these realities is the fact that the historic missions have largely lost their mobility, and are bogged down within a framework of interchurch relationships in which both the impulse and the freedom to pioneer have been all but lost. We have been preoccupied with the transfer of

responsibility from mission to indigenous church—a proper and necessary development. But in the process there has been a disastrous loss of initiative in mission. The lost initiative has, in many cases, passed to the "sects"; uninhibited by any theories regarding relationships with the established younger churches, they take their opportunities where they find them.

The most pressing need of the historic missionary movement today is to find a way by which, as the foreign mission merges in the established indigenous church, new forms of missionary agency will come to birth, to press out into the "regions beyond." These new forms must represent a genuine partnership between younger and older churches. They must express the reality of the Church universal and of a missionary obligation which belongs to the whole Church and which cannot be "transferred" from one group of Christians to another.

This is the crux of contemporary missionary policy. We owe it to the pioneering "sects" that they have, despite the inadequacy of their own theology and methods, helped to expose some of the inadequacies of the churches and missionary agencies which are pleased to regard themselves as ecumenical.

A young missionary in Indonesia recently remarked to me: "The irony of our situation is that we have allowed our missionary outreach to grind to a standstill because we have been *too* ecumenical." He was not repudiating ecumenism. But he was putting his finger on what is perhaps the most formidable and the most important unresolved problem of modern missionary and ecumenical strategy—a problem which has been heightened by the missionary activity of the "sects." This problem will only find solution as the missionary enterprise learns how, in the new situation, to recover the old freedom to pioneer in the "regions beyond," and to engage in a true partnership between older and younger churches in new ventures in the unfinished task of world evangelism.

# Crisis and Creativity

*"Religion in Crisis and Custom"*

**ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR.**

## I

IT HAS OFTEN BEEN SAID that religion is a creature of crisis. Crisis in depth and religion in depth seem curiously to combine, both in the individual and in society. This is not surprising. Religion broadly interpreted has to do with man's relation to life's ultimate meaning and worth. And "Every child that's born alive is either a little Liberal or else a little Conservative." Or, more prosaically, we are all coerced and molded by the society with which we emotionally identify. It is therefore natural and inevitable that deep social disturbance should stir the depths of individual self-assurance and other-relatedness.

But there are other considerations involved in an adequate analysis of these three factors: social crisis, personal crisis, and religion. For example, it must be realized that personal crisis may be directly caused by inner personal disorganization organic in origin, or induced by "outside" forces which might operate in any social setting, or indeed may be attributable to some form of mystic confrontation of an Ultimate Reality untrammelled by finite restraints of space and time. Also the astounding variety of the responses elicited among folk who share the same social crisis has long since convinced us of the baffling operation of the personal and peculiar when we try to make predictions. The sinking "Titanic" is to one passenger a challenge to quiet courage and self-sacrifice, to another the triggered release of panic fear and struggle for self-preservation. On the campus of the University of Alabama, some students and some townsfolk seize the opportunity to release pent-up aggression, others sign a petition for the readmission of Miss Lucy to her classes.

Crisis rouses emotions. Crisis induces action. As to what that action will be in terms personal and social, few scientists would care to offer dog-

---

ARTHUR L. SWIFT, JR., B.D., Ph.D., formerly Professor of Church and Community, Union Theological Seminary, New York City, is now Dean of the School of Politics and Vice-President, The New School for Social Research, New York City.

matic prediction, and the convinced mystic would add the further awesome imponderables, God and the Devil.

We have indicated that the phenomenon of crisis may be chiefly characterized as individual or social, as induced from within the person affected, or from without; and that these external sources may be in other individuals, in the natural environment (iceberg and "Titanic"), or in supra-human confrontation through mystic revelation. Unfortunately any particular situation of crisis is likely to be compounded of a mixture of these characteristics. And the attitudes and behaviors observed, if they are to be understood, must be studied in the perspective of history. For the traditions and beliefs and expectations of the past persist into the present to modify it. Although all change does not involve crisis, all crisis means change. Innovation is the kind of change that must first appear as an idea in some human mind. Religious revelation and prophecy have been a significant source of innovation. The small sects in America have displayed some astounding variants, economic, sexual, social, and theological. Most of these variants, like the plurality of wives in Mormonism, have yielded to the pressures of the larger society. But they are none the less important to a psychological and social understanding of the sects.

Anton T. Boisen in *Religion in Crisis and Custom*<sup>1</sup> brings to this confused and confusing scene a clearly formulated hypothesis, a central article of his faith, which deserves careful and prayerful consideration. It is established in the light of his own personal experience with critical mental illness, and guided by seven years of exceptional training in the theory and practice of sociological analysis, enlightened by independent studies of particular parishes and especially of Holiness Churches, analyzed and weighed by seventeen years of study in the joint conduct of seminars at the Chicago Theological Seminary and by more than twenty years as Chaplain of the Elgin State Hospital.

"It is the thesis of this book," he writes,<sup>2</sup> "that crisis experiences have profound religious significance. Mental disorder as well as religious experience may be a manifestation of the power to heal and religious experience as well as mental disorder may involve emotional upheaval." . . . Or, with a different emphasis, he writes,<sup>3</sup> "The explanation may be found in our hypothesis that human nature is basically social, that the essence of religious experience is the sense of union with the internalized fellowship

<sup>1</sup> Boisen, A. T., *Religion in Crisis and Custom*, Harper & Brothers, 1955. xv-271 pp. \$4.00.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87.

of the best; and that the essence of mental illness is the sense of isolation and estrangement from this same fellowship." In an address at a meeting of the National Council of Churches' Department of Pastoral Services on October 27, 1955, he phrased it as follows:

I therefore invite your attention to two forms of mental illness, the one malignant and the other benign. The former are manifestations of defective character structure. They develop gradually and make for isolation or for progressive dissolution of the personality. The latter are analogous to fever or inflammation in the body. Even though experiences of this type may display severely pathological phenomena, they are manifestations of healing power. Even though they may break as well as make, they are closely related to the dramatic conversion experiences which have been so prominent in the history of the Christian Church since the days of Saul of Tarsus.

It is his effort to establish a close similarity between dramatic conversion experiences in the Pentecostal Churches and the forms of serious mental illness that principally concerns us in this brief report upon a book deserving a more extended study.

## II

First it is wise to glance at his description of the steps or stages in the average case of schizophrenia.

*Crisis*

In the face of difficult life situations and serious personality maladjustments, the really malignant reactions are those of withdrawal and concealment in its various forms. Anxiety and self-blame, insofar as they represent the honest facing of the facts, are likely to result in constructive solutions, even though they may induce actual psychosis. Such disturbances . . . are characterized by marked religious concern and, when severe, by a constellation of ideas . . . of death, of rebirth, of previous incarnation, of cosmic catastrophe, of cosmic identification, and of prophetic mission.

*Mysticism*

Pathological experiences are frequently attended by religious concern, and religious experience of the dramatic type by pathological features. This is explained by the fact that both

may be attempts to solve some difficult and vital problem.<sup>4</sup>

The parallelism he establishes proves startlingly close. In the difficult depression years following 1929, when

*Crisis*

the old line Protestant churches showed an eleven per cent decrease in membership, the Holiness sects of the more sedate variety increased fifty per cent and the more radical Pentecostal groups more than trebled. . . .<sup>5</sup> Although arising among the underprivileged and rooted in the social and economic injustices of our

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

*Mysticism*

present-day civilization, the Pentecostal sects concern themselves not at all with the problem of social betterment. They are not seeking to save the world but to save individuals out of a world which is getting worse and worse. . . .<sup>6</sup> For many of them . . . it has meant . . . a defiance of convention, a break with the past, a venturing forth upon uncharted seas. They are radical mystics, but as often happens, their mystical experiences have given emotional validation to traditions familiar from childhood, traditions to which most men merely pay lip service. . . .<sup>7</sup>

*Fundamentalism*

The Pentecostal sects undoubtedly belong in the group of the eccentric and even of the regressive. Some of their fundamental assumptions are fallacious and dangerous. They believe that the divine manifests itself in the unusual and that the prompting which seems to come from without is thereby authoritative.<sup>8</sup> . . . To find themselves doing things they can't account for is for them the all-sufficient evidence of control by the Holy Spirit. . . .

*Healing Power*

Yet with all their weaknesses these sects have constructive features which far outweigh the destructive and the regressive. They are manifestations of nature's power to heal. They are spontaneous attempts on the part of the common people to deal constructively with the stresses and trials which fall with peculiar severity upon them. These Pentecostal sects are bringing to many distressed individuals release from the burden of guilt. They are giving them hope and courage and strength in the face of difficulties. Insofar as the sects succeed in this, their economic and social status is likely to be raised.<sup>9</sup> . . . The Pentecostal sects are an expression of the same zeal and enthusiasm out of which some of the great religious movements have sprung. . . .

*Self-analysis*

The rapid growth of mystical sects during the depression may be explained by the fact that a considerable number of people, facing serious hardship, reacted in accordance with the Christian principles in which they had been reared. . . . They took stock of their own shortcomings. Thinking and feeling together intensely regarding the ultimate issues of life, they found their sense of fellowship deepened. Religion came alive for them. The reaction was a benign one . . . a manifestation of nature's power to heal. . . . The eccentric and regressive movements are leveled up and become respectable, while the forward-looking prophetic movements are leveled down and become conventionalized.<sup>10</sup>

Beyond question there is much to be learned about the psychology of the Pentecostal sects from what is known about those forms of mental ill-

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 75.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 92.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 93-94.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 90.

ness classified as schizophrenia from its milder to its more serious manifestations. And surely Dr. Boisen is uniquely qualified to speak with authority on this theme. As already indicated, the parallelism is remarkable. Both patterns of behavior arise in crisis. Both offer the alternatives of regression or acceptable adjustment. For those who choose the latter, both present the opportunity for a frank facing of the facts of sin, create in the individual a strong sense of guilt. And both center the attention on the task of personal salvation. Both develop in the individual some preoccupation with ideas of death and of rebirth, and often of cosmic catastrophe or of cosmic identification. Both are at times irrational. Both produce adjustment which is "a manifestation of healing power."

Surely more than mere analogy underlies this parallelism. In both types of situation a human being is responding to crisis in an effort at adjustment. Finding his private world in chaos, he looks for stability outside of it, in the cosmos itself. Often he feels identified with and somehow responsible for this cosmic order. Such seeming irrationality may in fact be a glimpse of Reality beyond reason. If he survives this apocalypse, he may return healed and bearing a message of salvation. In summary and inadequate fashion this expresses the meaning to Dr. Boisen of his own mental illness and that of Saul of Tarsus and many others, prophets and saints in varying degree offering proof of the hypothesis that such "crisis experiences have profound religious significance," and can and sometimes do prove to be not destructive but signally creative.

### III

But the parallelism as developed by Dr. Boisen seems at some points far from clear. Psychologically there is no parallel in the experience of the mentally ill to the powerful interpersonal stimulus and response so characteristic of the group behavior of the Pentecostals. Nor does the mental patient feel the pressures to conformity in his disturbed behaviors that the accepted patterns of group behavior enforce upon the convert or the inquirer. Furthermore the clear and determinative choice between regression and adjustment which faces the mental patient seems but vaguely present in the sect. And although it is true, as Dr. Boisen says, that great religious movements have similarly arisen, there is little indeed of the creative and significantly new in the message of the Pentecostals. At most it seems to provide compensatory emotional outlets and promises of "pie in the sky" that make the endurance of social injustice and deprivation endurable. This is surely important to these ardent and faithful folk, as is

the companionship in faith that their church provides. But these Pentecostal sects, though fascinating to the social scientist and a challenge to the stuffy dignity of the old-line churches, have little of the regal drama of the schizophrenic who descends into hell and ascends into heaven before he returns to enlighten the world.

However, this is too facile a dismissal of the author's central hypothesis. Whitehead's famous definition of religion as what a man does with his own solitariness is true of one aspect of religious experience. Boisen's insistence that "the essence of religious experience is the sense of union with the internalized fellowship of the best" is also in a measure true. Neither definition seems clearly to recognize the existence of a personal God responding in love to his children. But to Boisen the sense of solitariness—at least "of isolation and estrangement" from this fellowship of the best—is "the essence of mental illness." Perhaps Whitehead would agree that to do the wrong thing with one's solitariness would be madness indeed. For there is a terrifying sense in which the man altogether alone suffers the tortures of hell. There is also the vision of the fellowship of the saints in light. And though the mental patient often feels himself cut off from all companionship, yet his visions and aspirations may guide him home again to family and to friends.

And there is a challenge in Dr. Boisen's declaration of faith in the ultimate significance of that hard-won vision of Cosmic Order and Beauty which comes to those mental patients brave enough to confront it open-eyed. "The old Christian mystics," he writes,<sup>11</sup> "had to learn the lesson that some of the ideas which came darting into their minds could hardly come from God. They assumed that they must come from the devil. Some of us today need to learn the converse principle that not every hallucination is necessarily of the devil." This phrase thus deftly turned is really of great importance to his whole theory and to the book's main demonstration of it in other and larger areas of life than the sects can offer. Every major crisis affords the individual or the nation confronting it the alternatives of despair and destruction or of hope and a spiritual creativity which cracks the mold of custom and builds new organizations of life and society.

In his earlier book, *The Exploration of the Inner World*,<sup>12</sup> Dr. Boisen sought to establish the truth of his own experience of creative insight at the heart of mental disorder, by careful documentation of other men's like

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 90.

<sup>12</sup> Harper & Brothers, new ed., 1952.

experiences and the truths they found in them. In this book he further tests his thesis, now a strong conviction, in a wide range of social situations including individual lives but moving on from there into the study of the sects, and of old-line churches in small towns, and of war as illustrating the malignant and destructive choice rather than the benign and creative one. He studies religious leaders and their creativity in crisis, and the evolution of Methodism from sect to church. Next he views in perspective the history of religion in its creativity and conservatism, judges the central tenets of American Protestantism and the processes whereby faith is perpetuated and recreated, and confronts with hope and assurance the present world crisis and the future of Christian civilization.

In many of these latter chapters he writes with an assured conviction that can stem only from some deep and mystic source, a conviction brought back perhaps from his own confrontation of Ultimate Cosmic Reality. He has used science as far as it would take him and has gone on from there. The ultimate challenge to the man of science, who will accept as true no statement he cannot prove, must be this calm insistence that in crises of the mind and of society among both the learned and the unlettered, who face it unafraid, some healing vision of eternal truth is given.

# Rethinking the Protestant Doctrine of Vocation

E. CLINTON GARDNER

THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE of vocation defines the perspective in which the responsible Christian undertakes to do the Divine will at the "post assigned him by the Lord."<sup>1</sup> Protestantism, following Scripture and the Reformers, views all of life as being under the calling of God. Man is summoned to accept the Divine intention and the Divine will and to bring his own will into subjection to that of God. The God who calls man to his service is one, but he makes his will known to man in three major roles. In the first place, he confronts man as the Creator who has made and continually sustains the heavens and the earth and all that in them is. In the second place, he confronts man as the Judge and Governor whose will is normative for all human conduct. Finally, he confronts man as the Redeemer who amid all of man's disorder is reconciling man unto himself and liberating him from bondage to evil.

While the redemptive work of God represents the most distinctively Christian understanding of the Divine nature in that here the work of the Creator and Judge are most clearly seen to be ultimately the work of love (*agape*), nevertheless the Divine love cannot be adequately understood apart from its manifestation in creation and judgment. Only as the Christian confronts the total activity of God is he able to respond to the total will and purpose of God. Thus, if one thinks of God exclusively in terms of his work as Creator, he will respond to only a part of the Divine will and tend to neglect the extent to which the Divine intention in creation has been thwarted by sin and the manner in which the will of God must be understood in terms that are relevant to man's disorder on account of the hardness of his heart.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, one who views the Divine summons as being primarily that of a Judge or Cosmic Discipliner will tend to see his vocation as a negative calling to asceticism or renunciation. And one who

<sup>1</sup> Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. III, Ch. X. par. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Mark 10:5.

---

E. CLINTON GARDNER, B.D., Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Christian Social Ethics at the Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia. He approaches the doctrine of vocation through the aspects of God as Creator, Judge, and Redeemer.

responds only to the summons of the Redeemer will be tempted to allow his service to degenerate into sentimentality and irresponsible forms of social action.

It is the purpose of the present paper to examine the Protestant doctrine of vocation in the light of the varied forms of Divine activity in which God makes his will known to man and through which he summons man to his service. Some very un-Protestant misconceptions of this teaching will be considered, and certain implications of the fundamental concept which need to be explored and developed in order that its true meaning may be made freshly relevant will be suggested.

## I

In the first place, work viewed as a positive vocation means that it represents "a general calling to all men, grounded in the very structure of creation" to participate systematically and persistently in the process of meeting genuine human needs.<sup>3</sup> Work understood as service of God is at the same time service of man, the child of God. Viewed in this light, of course, much modern expenditure of energy falls under judgment, for it seeks to exploit the neighbor by the creation of artificial "needs." Much of it is also undertaken primarily from the motives of one's own desires for pleasure, or profit, or power. But work viewed as a calling to participate in creation is work that seeks to meet the genuine needs of the neighbor.

From a negative point of view the Protestant doctrine of vocation as set forth by Luther meant a denial of any hierarchy of work. Following Aquinas, the medieval church had made a qualitative distinction between the values of different kinds of work. The monks and priests alone had a divine vocation, for they alone were called to specifically religious or spiritual tasks. Consequently, their work was accorded the highest status in the sight of the church and of God. Other forms of endeavor were considered secular and assigned a lower rank. Luther challenged this exaltation of spiritual tasks at the expense of devaluing all forms of secular work, and he affirmed instead the New Testament message that every Christian—whatever his abilities, whatever his station—is called into the service of God and hence each may view the work which he is doing as a divine calling or vocation in so far as it ministers to the needs of his fellow men. No work which is a divine service is low, for it is ennobled by the highest calling, *viz.*, the calling of God.

<sup>3</sup> Calhoun, R. L., *God and the Day's Work*, New York, 1943, p. 47.

Hence, the difference in value between various forms of work does not lie in the kind of work which is performed but rather in its having or not having this divine purpose. As Brunner declares, "The valuation of work is shifted from the 'what' to the 'why' and 'how.'"<sup>4</sup> Luther saw clearly that the principle of justification by faith ruled out every form of works-righteousness for the bishop and the pope as well as for the house-maid. Whatever one's occupation, one is called to be a Christian in that particular station. What Luther did not give adequate attention to is the equally important element implicit in the Pauline view of the divine vocation, viz., the summons to serve God through one's occupation as well as within it.<sup>5</sup>

But the meaning of Luther's denial of any hierarchy of works has been largely missed by modern Protestantism—a fact which is indicated by the spiritual snobbery which is frequently manifested by young people who expect to find their places, and by adults who have found their places, in various forms of religious work and in the respectable middle-class professions. Professor Alexander Miller points out, for example, that the more pious and theologically concerned young people in our churches tend to assume that the highest callings, the ones which those who are whole-hearted enough to give up the hope of financial rewards offered by business and the secular professions will follow, are the ministry, missionary work, teaching, Christian social service, and the like.<sup>6</sup>

In a somewhat modified form the medieval conception of a scale of works having different spiritual values also persists in the tendency of most other young people who expect to find their places and their callings without betraying their Christian loyalties to choose the secular professional and business activities such as medicine and law or research and management. In general this latter group represents the middle class, and it is the only group that finds the doctrine of vocation at all intelligible in terms other than a calling to specifically religious work. Fortunately there are indications from Christian Youth Conferences that this situation is changing, but it continues to exist in many quarters.<sup>7</sup> Clearly it still needs to be protested against, and the church sorely needs to find positive ways of making the concept of vocation meaningful in terms of the work done by factory employees, mill hands, cab drivers, and tenant farmers.

<sup>4</sup> Brunner, Emil, *Christianity and Civilisation*, Part II: *Specific Problems*, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1949, p. 62.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. 12:6.

<sup>6</sup> Hutchinson, J. A., ed., *Christian Faith and Social Action*, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1953, pp. 133-134.

<sup>7</sup> Trueblood, D. E., *Your Other Vocation*, Harper & Brothers, 1952, p. 66.

The significance of the biblical and Protestant doctrine of vocation as the denial of any hierarchy of works has also been widely misunderstood in another way. Attention has frequently become so exclusively centered on the negative aspect of this teaching that the secular forms of work are often considered to be religious in themselves. Thus, it is not recognized that no kind of work—"spiritual" or "secular"—is a divine vocation unless it is undertaken in the spirit of accepting a summons from God to his service. Not every work is a divine calling, but any work done as a holy vocation is equally worthy in the sight of God with any other work done in the same spirit. The Protestant doctrine, in short, does not underwrite secularism in the name of religion, but it declares that all secular forms of work may be converted into religious vocations, provided that they minister to man's needs. More attention needs to be paid, however, to the fact that for the Christian of today, as for the early Christians, some forms of employment (e.g., dope-peddling and dishonest forms of advertising) are ruled out since they do not minister to the neighbor's need but rather contribute to the corruption of both the individual and society.

The negative meaning of the doctrine of vocation gains its true significance only when the positive meaning of this concept is clearly understood. Stated thus, all work is to be undertaken as service of God, i.e., for the glory of God. We are called to be "fellow workmen for God."<sup>8</sup> But this is precisely the aspect of the doctrine of vocation which the Church finds it most difficult to make meaningful to contemporary man.

This conviction means, first of all, as we have seen, that man's work must be placed in the larger context of the divine calling by the Creator to minister to all genuine human need—individual or social; domestic, economic, political, or spiritual. For most people, however, the understanding of their work has been divorced from this perspective, with the result that Western man has fallen prey to work-idolatry, or a kind of "work-anesthesia," stemming to a large extent out of this spiritual impoverishment of modern man which causes him to seek escape from the meaninglessness of life by work.<sup>9</sup> Of course, it needs to be recognized that for most people who do not view their occupations as divine callings, work represents many values including but by no means limited to financial gain; but it seems clear that for many, especially the older segment of our population, it is little more than a means of escape from an otherwise empty

<sup>8</sup> Cf. 1 Cor. 3:9.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 70. I am indebted to Dr. Nolan B. Harmon for the suggestive term "work-anesthesia."

existence. Faced with this situation, the Protestant doctrine of vocation has two things to say to modern man. On the one hand, it warns him of the idolatrous character of his worship of work as an end in itself. It reminds him of the need for seeing his work in terms of the ends to be achieved and particularly in the perspective of the purposes of the Creator who ordains that man shall work. In the second place, this concept contains the implicit demand for a far broader definition of work in terms that will include all of those activities the aim of which is to meet genuine human needs.

For the masses work has become largely an economic concept, and it is one that gives significance to a continually diminishing segment of life both in terms of day-to-day living and in terms of normal life expectancy. Thus, in their study, *The Meaning of Work and Retirement*, Eugene A. Friedmann and Robert J. Havighurst declare:

In a work-centered society such as ours has been in the past, work is certainly more effective than play in providing self-respect and gaining the respect of others. It seems unlikely that the present generation of older people reared with work-centered attitudes can get much self-respect out of leisure-time activities. Most of them, if they are forced to retire, will maintain their own self-respect and the respect of others by their reputation as successful workers and their feeling that retirement is a reward for a well-spent lifetime of work.<sup>10</sup>

Such is the poverty of our work and of our leisure that this seems to be the typical outlook on life of an estimated ten million unemployed people over the age of sixty-five living in the United States. It is estimated that by 1975 there will be eighteen million people in this age bracket.<sup>11</sup> Such facts as these make it clear how desperate is the demand for a reinterpretation of work in terms that are relevant and meaningful to modern man.

The church—clergy and laity alike—have a clear summons at this point to minister to the genuine needs of men by challenging the work-idolatry to which they have contributed by too exclusive and narrow an emphasis upon work. The life of work should be enriched by giving more attention to all forms of endeavor which meet the social and spiritual necessities of employers and employees. Encouragement should be given to, and provision made for, such activities as contribute to the fulfillment and enrichment of the social life of men viewed as members of a human and spiritual (i.e. noneconomic) community—activities which we commonly relegate to the area of play and recreation or which we neglect (family life, artistic pursuits).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Friedmann and Havighurst, *The Meaning of Work and Retirement*, Chicago, 1954, p. 191.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 188.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Trueblood, *op. cit.*, pp. 97ff.

Not only would such an enlargement of the conception of work result in economic employment that is more satisfying, but it would make the transition from employment to retirement much less difficult and far more full of hope; for what work means to a person determines to a large extent what his retirement will mean to him.<sup>13</sup> If people are able to find the meanings—or new or greater ones—in retirement than they previously found in their financially gainful employment, then retirement will be a blessing to them. But here is precisely the point at which the church needs to explore new ways in which the neighbor's needs can be met; here in an age in which our present-day system of production points to the day when the consumer-demands of the world's population can be met with less and less expenditure of time and human energy, we are called to discover the other needs—less tangible, less material, but ever more pressing from a psychological point of view, as the way of escape into work-idolatry becomes increasingly closed to the masses for a large portion of their lives.

Paradoxically, the spiritual impoverishment of which Brunner speaks frequently issues in the attempt to escape from work as well as into work—the former because work is meaningless, the latter because leisure is even more empty. Thus, many who look forward to retirement as "a reward for a well-spent lifetime of work," and labor leaders who champion a thirty-hour week often find little meaning in work apart from the economic reward. The task at which one gains his livelihood tends to become a chore, the performance of which entitles one to a certain amount of leisure in which to live. The last of life becomes the part "for which the first was made" in a sense never intended by the author of that line.<sup>14</sup> But here we come face to face with the relation of work to worship, a theme the development of which lies beyond the scope of the present essay.

There is another aspect of work viewed as participation in the creative purposes of God which particularly needs further consideration. Each person is called to discover and develop his special capacities which have been entrusted to him as gifts by the Creator, gifts both for enjoyment and service. There are diversities of gifts, and each person is summoned to live his own life to the full. The acceptance of this call ennobles all forms of work that are undertaken for the glory of God and rules out any hierarchical scale of values as regards the kinds of work performed.

As indicated above, this is an aspect of the doctrine of vocation which

<sup>13</sup> Friedmann and Havighurst, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

<sup>14</sup> Browning, Robert, *Rabbi Ben Ezra*.

the Reformers did not sufficiently develop. It is perhaps true to say that most people do not have an opportunity to choose occupations which will give full range to their gifts, but in our society at least most people have a larger area of freedom in choosing their life's work than they give responsible consideration to, and here is a sphere in which the Protestant understanding of the divine calling is particularly relevant. It warns us against the temptation to develop only those gifts which will give the greatest security or the greatest prestige in terms of one's socio-cultural group. It calls each instead to be a true individual and thus make his unique contribution to the enrichment of the common life as well as the personal one. There is a vocation of choice as well as of acceptance, but what is needed in any case is "a readiness to do one's best at the most promising task available" with the recognition that an ordinary job may turn out amazingly well if one gives it a fair chance.<sup>15</sup>

The Christian concept of a calling to be oneself under God is not to be confused with the self-realization type of ethical ideal which puts the emphasis upon the self-conscious development of whatever powers one possesses for one's own enrichment and satisfaction; rather, Christianity describes the path—a paradoxical one—by which one's powers and faculties may reach their fullest fruition, namely by losing one's life through devotion to an end beyond oneself. Only through the application and surrender of one's particular abilities, whatever they may be, to appropriate service of God and neighbor are one's particular abilities and powers developed and fulfilled. The differing gifts are neither to be neglected nor pursued hedonistically; rather, they are to be brought into subjection to the will of God. They comprise the equipment with which we are called to man the "station" at which God has placed us.

## II

The Protestant concept of vocation means that man is called to his work by God who is not only Creator but also *Judge*. Hence, man is called to accept the restrictions and limitations which are placed upon him by his status of dependence, by his finiteness, and as "punishment" for his sin. Thus, God placed man in the Garden of Eden "to dress it and to keep it,"<sup>16</sup> but he also set bounds beyond which man might not go without vio-

<sup>15</sup> Calhoun, R. L., *op. cit.*, p. 62. See also John F. Sleeman, *Basic Economic Problems*, London, 1953, pp. 170-171, and D. W. Harwell, "The Lay Christian and His Vocation," *RELIGION IN LIFE*, Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (Spring, 1955), pp. 219-227.

<sup>16</sup> Gen. 2:15.

lating his moral nature and losing his ability not to sin. And after the fall a "curse" was pronounced upon man, so that his work became burdensome and partook of the nature of discipline and judgment.

One who would accept his work as a vocation from God the Judge and Orderer must therefore deny himself. To glorify God in work is to participate in creation; it is also to deny oneself. It is to accept the discipline imposed by work as the cost of serving God by ministering to the needs of one's fellow men and of developing the powers and abilities with which one has been entrusted. Love and self-denial go hand in hand. The former is impossible without the latter, and the latter is no virtue apart from the former.<sup>17</sup>

Work viewed as a divine calling to self-denial has frequently been perverted in a very self-assertive way, to preserve the *status quo* and to encourage those who receive much less than justice from our social order to be content with their lot as a divine calling. Thus, those who profit from segregation frequently call upon the Negro to accept his calling to deny himself and be submissive to the traditional pattern of racial separation, and laborers are exhorted to deny themselves for the sake of the "American way" in capitalism—a way which is frequently identified with Christianity and which it is alleged the industrial laborers are therefore called to support. Within the broad context of the social and economic and political *status quo* each person is called to be honest, industrious, thrifty, square-dealing, dependable, courageous, faithful, sober. This, it is alleged, is the Christian's vocation.<sup>18</sup> The social matrix in which the individual must work, it is frequently assumed, is wholesome and self-regulating, or at least whatever reforms are needed in the social order will come if only individual managers and employees will practice the foregoing individual virtues.

Marx had more than a half-truth at this point: religion *is* frequently used as an instrument of exploitation. But Marx was only seeing what prophetic spokesmen for religion from Amos to Charles Kingsley have always seen and inveighed against. The workers, the clergy, the teachers, our maids, the Negroes should deny themselves, for this is their calling which they should accept "for the glory of God" who has placed them at their particular stations in life. Hence, it is argued, they must never invoke their own rights but must always give them up to those who would usurp them.

<sup>17</sup> Calvin, *op. cit.*, III, Ch. VII; 1 Cor. 13:3.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Jasper E. Crane's critical comments on the Statement concerning Christianity and Economic Life, adopted by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Sept. 15, 1954, in *Social Action* Vol. XXI, No. 5 (Jan., 1955), pp. 18-20.

This, as Luther and Calvin saw, is not the true meaning of self-denial. True self-denial means that one is prepared to do whatever may be demanded by love at any particular time in any concrete situation. In matters which concern oneself, Luther declared, the Christian is to suffer injustice to himself, but in matters which concern others he is to govern himself according to love and "suffer no injustice for (his) neighbor's sake."<sup>19</sup> Calvin rightly insisted that the Christian must be very cautious in his appeal to litigation to protect his rights and must be willing to surrender his personal rights when charity so demands, rather than foment contention and enmity; but he also acknowledged that the Christian may appeal to the magistrate to protect his personal rights, since the magistrate is God's agent upon earth to execute judgment upon evil.

Although Calvin stressed the *right* of the citizen to appeal to the magistrate to vindicate his claims, there is implicit in his thought the idea that we have noted in Luther, viz., that the Christian out of love *ought* to invoke his personal rights when the needs of the neighbor, including both society and the adversary, demand such an appeal to justice; for the magistrate's office is of God, and he ought not to bear the sword in vain. Thus, while Christians "are required to bless and pray for them from whom they receive curses, to do good to them from whom they experience injuries, and . . . to 'overcome evil with good,'" they must at the same time seek that which is for the good of their adversaries.<sup>20</sup> To claim one's right may be a work of love; it may be precisely what charity demands. As Paul Ramsey puts the matter,

Personal rights as well as the rights of others are derived from Christian love, but it must always be remembered that these personal rights are concretely determined by the obligations which the needs of the neighbor place upon their bearer. . . . They are "derived backward" from consideration of the neighbor; or "elicited" as forms of neighbor-love.<sup>21</sup>

Hence, "if, as a good Christian," a Negro in a segregated society "is willing to endure the injustice of his position—so far as *he* is concerned—for the sake of others he ought not to do so."<sup>22</sup> To invoke one's personal rights for his neighbor's sake is also the Christian's vocational duty.

The Protestant doctrine of vocation as involving a call to self-denial is also misinterpreted by those who apply it in an ascetic way so that one

<sup>19</sup> *Works*, Philadelphia, 1943, Vol. III, pp. 241-242; cf. pp. 248-249.

<sup>20</sup> Calvin, *op. cit.*, Bk. IV, Ch. XX, par. 20.

<sup>21</sup> Ramsey, Paul, *Basic Christian Ethics*, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1950, p. 187.

<sup>22</sup> Brunner, Emil, *The Divine Imperative*, translated by Olive Wyon, The Westminster Press, 1937, p. 431.

uncritically assumes that the most onerous and undesired work is necessarily the activity to which one is called. While there is great danger that man will seek to avoid his summons to duty when it involves unpleasant and burdensome forms of work and inadequate financial rewards, there is also the subtle danger of Pharisaism or works-righteousness which may cause him to choose the form of work which seems to him most severe without proper attention to his gifts, his disposition and abilities, which would make another form of work more appealing and more serviceable for the particular person. The Christian is not called to self-denial as an end in itself but only as a necessary means to glorifying God and serving the neighbor. The Christian is not called into a new bondage of asceticism or self-justification; rather, he is called to freedom and to service of God and neighbor according to his gifts. The summons to love is only incidentally a summons to self-denial, and, paradoxically, the call to self-denial turns out to be the path to true self-fulfillment and joy. "He who loses his life for my sake will find it."<sup>23</sup>

### III

Work considered as a divine calling means, in the third place, that one is summoned to participate in the work of *redemption*. Man is called to work together with God in the freeing of men from sin and the consequences of sin so that God's purposes for man may be realized "on earth as in heaven." This aspect of the divine calling is, of course, closely related to the call of God the Creator, but it involves a recognition of the pervasiveness, the destructiveness, and the blighting effects of sin together with a grateful acceptance of the liberation and salvation which God has brought and continues to work in the world.

The Christian is called to witness to this "good news" of salvation, but it is frequently assumed that this part of one's calling is discharged by the verbal proclamation of the gospel, by exhortation to an experience of personal salvation, and by the practice of a strict ethic in one's individual relationships. While it is certainly true that one is called to tell others about what God has done, verbal proclamation of the gospel becomes hypocrisy if it is not followed by works of love. While salvation as an individual experience of a changed relationship between the individual and God is essential, it is only the beginning of salvation as the redemption of mankind in a universal fellowship of love. And while the practice of a rigorous code of individual ethics is certainly obligatory upon the earnest

<sup>23</sup> Mt. 10:39.

Christian, a conception of ethics that is limited to these personal virtues is extremely truncated and naïve in its understanding of the social nature of the self. The self is not only an individual, but it is also a member of many groups whose actions have far-reaching effects for good or for evil.

The call to participate in the work of redemption implies that the individual should willingly accept his responsibility for the social order in which he and his neighbors live, and by whose common actions the basic needs of man the social animal are provided for. Not only is man summoned to responsible life in community in order that the social, political, and economic needs of society may be met most effectively, but he is also called to participate responsibly in these aspects of the common life as a condition of meeting man's spiritual needs. As Paul Tillich has pointed out, "there are social structures that unavoidably frustrate any spiritual appeal to the people subjected to them."<sup>24</sup> Economic and political conditions may become so oppressive that they are only blighting and destructive, thus constituting almost insurmountable obstacles to salvation—to the experience of being aware of God's love, of his acceptance, and of his forgiveness, and to the experience of growth in obedience, love, and grace.

John Bennett suggests, for example, certain economic conditions which may hinder and thwart Christian salvation.<sup>25</sup> In the first place, poor housing conditions affect the emotional growth of children and mar the family outlook on life in general. A second economic obstacle to salvation consists of the contrast in our society between extreme wealth and extreme poverty, which leads to a sense of injustice and bitterness and the erection of barriers to fellowship between the resulting classes and castes, between employers and employees, between the churches of "the possessed" and the churches of "the dispossessed." In the third place, unemployment, with the resulting soul-destroying feeling that one is not wanted, is clearly a hindrance to salvation. It is almost impossible to overestimate the corrosiveness and blighting power of this brutal form of rejection, and the blasphemy of Christians who content themselves with pious declarations of love and appeals for honesty, thrift, and sobriety.<sup>26</sup> Finally, the corruption of the moral climate by undue emphasis upon personal financial gain, by false standards of success, by dishonesty in advertising and selling, and by materialism constitutes a fourth obstacle to salvation.

If these, then, are some of the impediments to salvation found in the

<sup>24</sup> Tillich, Paul, *The Protestant Era*, Chicago University Press, 1948, p. xviii.

<sup>25</sup> Ward, A. D., ed., *Goals of Economic Life*, Harper and Brothers, 1953, p. 418.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Rom. 2:24: "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you."

social matrix itself, here surely is a Christian vocation, a call to work "for the glory of God," for the love of the neighbor under God. Here is an area for redemption, an area in which the neighbor and the self are seen as children of God whose destinies are inextricably tied up together and whose actions wittingly or unwittingly affect each other for good or ill. In all of our actions we meet our neighbor, and our neighbor is legion dwelling both near and far. If the love which the Christian is commanded to exemplify means anything, it means meeting people at the point of their need. Thus the command to love inevitably summons the Christian, whatever his means of gaining a livelihood, to participate in the redemption of the social structures of the day, a process which the Christian knows will not be completed in history because man "universally and persistently tends to be sinful,"<sup>27</sup> but a process in which the Christian participates in confidence and in hope.

---

<sup>27</sup> Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

# The Body of Christ as Metaphor or Fact

EDWIN McNEILL POTEAT

## I

DR. W. NORMAN PITTINGER, writing on "The Rethinking of the Christian Message" in a recent issue of *RELIGION IN LIFE*, says, among other important things: "It is plainly true that the language of our worship and of much of our traditional formulae is metaphorical in character. . . . The difficulty arises when we use language which is symbolical in nature as if it were literal predication."<sup>1</sup>

Metaphor is word magic. Magic is illusion which creates for an act or object a quality it does not inherently possess. Hats do not contain rabbits; a human body cannot be sawed in two without injury; a solid object cannot vanish into nowhere. But sleight-of-hand can make us believe, momentarily, that a man may carry rabbits in his topper; that a body can be harmlessly halved by a buzz saw; and that a vase of flowers can, at a signal, dissolve and leave not a petal behind.

Metaphor is the legerdemain of language. We speak of gifted writers as performing magic with words. This generally means that they can take a plain word-idea and give it a quality it does not possess and thus make it do tricks.

Night's candles are burnt out and jocund day  
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain tops.

Here the night is said to possess candles, and the day has toes.

Macbeth doth murder sleep, the innocent sleep,  
Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care.

Here sleep has life that can be murdered and innocence that can be violated, to say nothing of the quaint capacity of knitting up a sleeve that care never wore. These tricks are literally as impossible as what magicians appear to do. For the instant that our minds yield themselves to these

---

<sup>1</sup> Winter 1954-55, p. 68.

---

EDWIN McNEILL POTEAT, Th.M., D.D., author, poet, and composer, was sometime President of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York, and minister of Pullen Memorial Baptist Church, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1948-1955. This article was one of his last writings before his death on December 17, 1955.

metaphors they bewitch our bone-hard literalisms and make them luminous. Or they can quite as easily shadow our minds. Death, the Grim Reaper, for example; it is unlikely that anyone watching the actual suspension of the vital processes sees an old man with a scythe, even in delirium.

This metaphorical or symbolic use of language—the former assigning a quality inherently unpossessed, the latter causing one thing to stand in the place of an authentic inner feeling—is immensely important. It is imaginative, and this indicates the development of the imagination in the growing mind. The child's imagination gives actuality to his ideas; his elders have grown out of this sort of fantasy-making, and imaginative and pictorial language, well used and properly understood, is a sign of intellectual maturity.

Metaphor also makes possible the creation of both beauty (or hideousness) and symbolism. Without these qualities we could have little thought and no literature. All word-ideas would be scraped to the bone (there's metaphor, you see!) and we would have something a cut lower than basic English; we would have bone English.

We are so accustomed to this that we can say outlandish things without fearing we shall be misunderstood. Thus, "My dear, she had on a divine little hat," knowing that divinity is not a property of head gear. Indeed we delight in encountering and fashioning new metaphors. "There was a rhubarb at home plate"; how utterly bewildering to the uninitiated; how completely expressive to the baseball fan! "The coach chewed out the team." These commonplace episodes take on vivacity by such bizarre descriptions. "The organist dragged the hymn." Of course he didn't, but we know what he did. Or, "the comedian killed the audience; knocked them cold; laid them in the aisles." A grisly performance, even in the pursuit of laughter! Not at all.

This sort of thing makes words into the prose or poetry of literature; makes artlessness into art. One problem of the translator of one lore to another arises here. It is said, for example, that the Bible is an oriental book and that orientals have a highly developed sense of imagery and symbol in their writings. Hence one must be careful, on the one hand, of taking literally certain metaphorical sayings of Jesus; and on the other, of making metaphors out of sayings that are starkly literal.

Metaphor, as Dr. Pittenger says, is harmless so long as it is not taken "as literal predication." When it is, metaphor can be mischievous. The converse danger exists where a hard literal fact becomes so repugnant that we can endure it only when we convert it into metaphor. Most of the

time, since picture-making is common to our habits of speaking and writing, we understand what we hear and read. When, however, we find that we have been treating metaphor as fact, or vice versa, it is necessary to examine the pictorial or literal phrase to be sure of its correct intention.

## II

Consider the word "sacrament." It is defined familiarly as the outward and visible sign of an inner, spiritual grace. However venerable this definition, it is, nonetheless, the language of metaphor. It assigns to an act something it does not inherently possess. The quality assigned belongs as an inner, spiritual grace to a person. Should the person know nothing of "inner spiritual grace," the "sacramental" act would be meaningless. For this reason some prefer to use "symbol" as a word which refers to an inner awareness. Uncle Sam is a symbol. Yet here also it is the inner feeling that is real; the symbol has only a transferred meaning.

The metaphorical nature of sacrament has always been troublesome. Baptism never wholly escapes the danger of being thought of as a waterrite in which the water possesses magical cleansing qualities. Similarly the Lord's Supper. Even the word "Eucharist" points out the lurking peril. *Eu*, well, plus *charizesthai*, to show favor, suggests that the partaking of the elements at the Lord's Table inherently possesses a good—*charis*. And when the elements of bread and wine, also called "The Eucharist," are said to be the "real presence" of Christ, whether by transubstantiation or consubstantiation, metaphor has for the communicant become fact. The "presence" is "real," not symbolic or figurative or metaphorical. Communion is then not only the sign of an inner spiritual grace; it is the alleged fact of partaking of the body tissue and the body blood of Christ.

This means that the Communion sacrament is something that is observed because a deep inner feeling has extrapolated the quality of the desire to share in Christ to an external act (eating) and to external things (bread and wine). Language provides the means of this transference, but at the same time creates the risk of encouraging our mistaking metaphor for fact. It is hardly necessary to specify the errors that run from *naiveté* to superstition because of this. The outward sign of an inner grace can become, to the credulous and incautious, sheer magic. One hardly needs to mention the circumstance that the "sacrament of ordination" assumes manual contact necessary for the transmission of grace. Canon C. E. Raven, com-

menting on this, added that if it is so, "then let us also admit that the church is still living in the age of magic."<sup>2</sup>

This does not cancel the inner spiritual grace which can, indeed, be experienced without the outward visible form. At least so the Quakers believe. We simply say that when metaphor becomes fact to the communicant, the inner grace has produced external magic, creating the illusion of a quality innately unpossessed by the symbol.

### III

Consider in this connection the phrase, "The Body of Christ." This is, of course, pure metaphor, designating the fellowship of confessed and covenanted believers in Christ. In some denominations it includes the unconfessed also, those who, unaware of the covenant into which they are introduced, are by the "sacrament" of infant baptism (recall the ritual and note how heavy it is with metaphor) given status within the church.

"The Body of Christ" is a metaphor of great beauty, so venerable indeed that even to examine it seems a sacrilege. And yet it is an unhappy metaphor. By intention designed to sharpen thought on the relation of Christ to his followers, it carries in its pictorial suggestiveness certain factors which are contradictory if not indeed absurd.

Twice St. Paul uses the metaphor: "Now you are the body of Christ" (1 Cor. 12:27) and "The church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22f.).<sup>3</sup> Of these two the latter is generic; he did not say to the church in Corinth which, at that time, was quarreling about organization, that the church *in extenso* was the Body of Christ. The Ephesian comment, directed to all the scattered groups in Galatia, gives so wide a coverage as to be all but universal.

But St. Paul used other metaphors also. "We, though many, are one body *in* Christ and individually members one of another" (Rom. 12:5). This is a different figure of speech. In 1 Cor. 11:3 he refers to Christ as the head, and the metaphor is hierarchical not anatomical. Eph. 4:12 speaks of edifying (building up) the body of Christ, as though it were incomplete or infirm. Again in Eph. 5:23-24 we discover, "the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior," etc. This whole passage is confused in its references to church and body. In verse 32 the author confesses at least to a great

<sup>2</sup> Raven, C. E., *The Good News of God*. Harper & Brothers, 1944, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup> Bible quotations are from the Revised Standard Version.

mystery when he identifies human marriage with Christ's relation to the Church. The metaphor here is no longer that of the Church as the body of Christ; it is the Church as the spouse of Christ. Col. 2:19, in a rebuke to useless ritualism, adds that the Colossians were "not holding fast to the Head, from whom the whole body, nourished and knit together through its joints and ligaments, grows with a growth that is from God." Here the metaphor presents a divine head to which a body, bound organically and ligatured, is what otherwise would be discrete, unorganized parts.

But not only St. Paul was concerned to picture this mystical union. There is a rock on which Christ was going to build his church in Matt. 16:18. Revelation 21:9 represents the holy city's descent as the approach of the Bride of the Lamb. According to Roman Catholic sacramentalism the Church is the Bride of Christ, and on Calvary the Church became the Mother of all who are born and live by grace. Mother and Bride, beautiful in suggestiveness but factually impossible. If our Lord himself had any metaphor which reflected his sense of relation to his followers it was the picture of the shepherd, the sheep, the fold, and the intimacy that was their ultimate protection.

Our point is that the great apostle was confronted by a fact so stupendous that he was forced, in describing it, into the use of metaphor. That he used several different ones, and that elsewhere in the New Testament there appear still others radically different in intimation, apparently did not—insofar as he was conversant with the growing Christian testimony—disturb him with a sense of inconsistency. And the reason for this is the fact that *he perhaps never thought that his metaphors would be mistaken for fact*. The fact was: a relation between the Risen Lord and the total corporation of his followers. Groping for expressive symbols, he used several figures of speech, of which we seem to have chosen one—perhaps the most difficult and mystifying of all—and made it the factual identification of Christ with the Church. There is no way of making a consistent pattern out of all the metaphors he and other New Testament writers used. We say, simply, that the Church is the Body of Christ. By the magic of words we have transmogrified a corporation into a corpus.

#### IV

It is at this point that we discover the mischief done. There are certain practical (literal, not metaphorical) consequences of this circumstance. The Church, by this literalism, becomes "sacramental." Despite the exegetical difficulties presented by the variety of metaphor we allow the church, be-

cause we say it is literally the Body of Christ, to assume qualities it does not inherently possess as the real body of covenanted followers. In its extreme form this makes the church the sole agent of salvation. *Extra ecclesia nulla salus.* Salvation, except as it provides metaphorical union of Christ and believer is not, in fact, of the Church.

Its priesthood, in a large segment of the Christian fellowship—as ministers of the sacraments (which, we repeat, are metaphorical)—become endowed with qualities which, as men, they do not inherently possess. This is sacerdotalism, so called. Hear C. E. Raven again: "It is a dreadful thing to imagine what becomes of the inside of a man when he makes himself a priest and ceases to be a human being."<sup>4</sup>

Church history is beholden to the Body of Christ metaphor, and thus is distorted or even falsified. The Body must have had continuity to have survived. To have survived it was necessary to have a qualified priesthood that was similarly unbroken. The facts of history as now known give no support to the continuous line of deacons, priests, and bishops which are made necessary by the logic of a living body. Since, treating the metaphor as fact, we say the Body has existed since the day of resurrection, we make history fit the metaphor even if it disputes the facts.

Of course this makes the place of the non-episcopal fellowships equivocal. They are members of the corporation of Christ but cannot be members of the corpus of Christ because human hands have not transmitted to their ministry the *charisma* that (cf. Raven above) the human hand, short of magic, cannot have. Furthermore, this metaphor has become a barrier to ecumenicity. The nature of the church is the rock on which a true unity of Christendom is wrecked in interdenominational conferences. If Rome and Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism all claim that they alone are the true Body of Christ and the custodians of its sacraments, those without the pale can have at best only a token fellowship with them. The scandal of this sort of thing was exhibited at Amsterdam where the Table of the Lord had to be protected against interlopers, not gate-crashers but humble Christians who, because they did not belong to the Body of Christ (which Body?), could not be allowed a place at the holy feast. This would be impossible except for the mistaking of a metaphor for a fact.

Without doubt, however, the most grievous error resulting from the misuse of St. Paul's metaphor is that it makes possible, if not indeed inescapable, a conflict between the mind of Christ and his body. The Body, if such the corporation must be called, is wounded, dismembered, and in

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

some of its functions enfeebled, atrophied, palsied. The Christian fellowship is varied, scattered, quarrelsome, irreconcilable. The pure metaphor allows us only to think of the body as whole and possessed of "sacramental" graces. Fact questions this.

Schism is sin, said Archbishop Temple. But it may be a sin against a metaphor, rather than against a fact. Grant that our divisions are unhappy, or even a scandal, they have come about because of the actions of those who believed the spirit of Christ—a fact of experience—was more compelling than the Body of Christ—a metaphor. This is the rudimentary meaning of the Reformation. Indeed the Reformers thought that in "dismembering the Body of Christ" they were doing God's will. It is conceivable that today in order to keep alive the spirit of Christ it may, at times, be necessary to break his Body. This is paradoxical only to those who make fact of metaphor.

One further practical consideration: the matter of racial segregation and the Church or churches. There is a race-rift in the Body; or should we use a metaphor and speak of the Body's whiteness in South Africa and blackness in Ethiopia, and of the tortured feelings of those who believe the body should be multicolored? Think of the circumstance that refuses Negro membership in a white church because "it would split the church"! Thus the minuscule and the global Body are kept intact by a cynical betrayal of the spirit of Christ. And the Body is sick.

## V

There is no more escape from metaphor and symbol than there is from fact and history. We may have to accommodate ourselves to the irreconcilability of the corporeal and covenant ideas of the Christian fellowship. And yet, beneath both is the struggle of an inner experience seeking, by almost any means, to express itself. Furthermore, we think that those who cling to the Body of Christ metaphor as alone—among other figures of speech—correctly expressing the relation between Christ and the Church are caught in the greater difficulties. At least a covenant idea of the church with Christ as its mystical Head (Lord) is descriptive of a fact of common experience, while the structural or body idea is not descriptive of common experience. It is word magic, assigning to something qualities it does not inherently possess.

It is as dangerous to be hypothetical as metaphorical, but one wonders whether St. Paul, suddenly finding himself today in a church fellowship he twice referred to as the Body of Christ, would not write an epistle, con-

fessing to the unhappy consequences of his lovely metaphor and deplored that so many of Christ's followers had mistaken it for a fact.

Jesus, we have said, used a happier metaphor: shepherd, fold, sheep. And yet this also has been abused by thinking of it as fact. For men aren't sheep; and the Church is not a fold. Nor is it "like a mighty army," nor is it the broad mother-bosom to which we are invited, by Rome, to regress.

No; we shall not escape the magic of language. Our salvation is not to refuse momentary beguilement by the magician's wand and word. This would be to withdraw one's self from the enrichment and inspiration of God's gift of picture-making with words, the mystery-laden symbols of ideas. But we can exercise the caution and the insight that are also God's gift for our understanding, and spare ourselves the confusion, the absurdity, and the practical folly that so often follow our mistaking metaphor for fact.

# Manuscripts and Peoples of the Judean Desert

WALTER J. HARRELSON

NO SUBJECT IN CONTEMPORARY biblical scholarship has aroused as much interest in the United States as that of the Dead Sea Scrolls. All media of communication have been exploited to tell the story of their discovery and contents. The finest study to date is without question that of Millar Burrows of Yale: *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: The Viking Press, 1955). Standard equipment for any biblical scholar is a series of lectures on the Scrolls. In fact, if interest continues to grow, it may soon be dangerous to life and limb to attend one of these lectures. Thus far no casualties have been reported, but the public is warned.

In February or March, 1947, Muhammad adh Dhib and a companion made the first discovery of manuscripts hidden away in a large jar in a small cave a short distance to the west of the upper reaches of the Dead Sea. Other jars which had no doubt contained manuscripts were also lying alongside the one with its treasure still intact. After a series of attempts to dispose of the documents in a country seething with preparations for war, the discoverers succeeded in selling them, illegally of course, to the Syrian Metropolitan in Jerusalem, Mar Athanasius Y. Samuel, and the late Professor E. Sukenik of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Scholars of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem identified the Metropolitan's portion of the manuscripts in the early spring of 1948; Professor Sukenik had already begun the preparation of his portion of the lot for publication. Publication of the Metropolitan's treasures was entrusted to the American School, with Professor Millar Burrows of Yale as the editor.

In 1949 it first became possible to excavate the cave in which the discovery had been made. Many additional manuscript fragments, plus pottery and portions of the linen which had covered the manuscripts, were unearthed by the excavators. When these finds had been examined it was

---

WALTER J. HARRELSON, B.D., Th.D., formerly Professor of Old Testament at Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts, is now Dean of Chicago University Divinity School, Chicago, Illinois. He has given us a comprehensive article on the far-famed Dead Sea Scrolls and the community that produced them.

possible to estimate the extent of this phenomenal discovery. Muhammad and his companion had disposed of the following treasures in ancient Hebrew: a complete manuscript of the book of Isaiah; another manuscript of Isaiah in fragmentary form but containing about one-third of the text of the canonical book; a commentary on the first two chapters of the book of Habakkuk; a document describing the internal order and rules for the life of the community from which the manuscripts had come; a group of psalms of thanksgiving; a document describing a great war between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness; and another document which could not then be unrolled, but has finally yielded to persistent efforts and turns out to be a rather romantic commentary in Aramaic on portions of the book of Genesis.

The excavators of the cave have been able to identify among their finds additional fragments of the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Psalms. Fragments of commentaries on the books of Micah, Zephaniah, and the Psalms also appeared. There were bits of manuscripts of the pseudepigraphical works known as Jubilees, the Testament of Levi, and others not yet certainly identified. In addition some words of Moses were found, plus some portions of a book of mysteries, additional sections of a manuscript like that called the Manual of Discipline, and some fragments of the book of Daniel in both the Hebrew and Aramaic portions. Fragments of liturgical texts also turned up, the nature of which has not yet been worked out.

In 1951 and 1952 other fragments began to turn up. These were traced to caves in the region of the first discovery by Father Roland de Vaux. When these caves were cleared, a vast new fund of manuscript fragments was at hand. In three caves of the region the following materials appeared. Portions of the book of Leviticus in the so-called "Phoenician" or early Hebrew writing were found, plus bits of the books of Exodus, Ruth, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Psalms. Some Hebrew and Aramaic fragments of nonbiblical books also were discovered. In addition there was found a copper scroll in three sheets which has just this year been unrolled and is now being studied at the University of Manchester. Its contents have not yet been reported.

In the fourth cave the most extensive finds appeared. About 330 manuscripts have thus far been distinguished. It is reported that there may have been more than one hundred biblical manuscripts. About ninety have already been identified. Every Old Testament book is represented among them except Esther. Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and the Psalms lead

the list in frequency of occurrence. There were also more commentaries on biblical books, among them treatments of the books of Isaiah, the Psalms, and some of the minor prophets. That on the book of Nahum is reported to contain sensational material, but it has not yet been published. In fact, only a very small portion of the manuscript material is yet available for study. A small international group of scholars is now preparing them for publication.

In the Judean desert to the south, other discoveries were made in 1951 and 1952. In the Wady Murabbaat several caves were found containing manuscripts. Fragments of the books of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and the Psalms have been identified. Letters to and from the Jewish rebel of A.D. 132-135, Simon ben Kosebah (often called bar Kochbah), were unearthed, together with contracts, letters, coins, and other materials which made it clear that the region was one of the headquarters for Jewish rebels of the period. It is also reported that there was a fragmentary column of a Greek translation of the book of Habakkuk, a find of great significance for the history of Old Testament translation. This is very likely our first Greek manuscript of the Old Testament, which could hardly have been influenced by the Christian community. Other evidence of great importance for the history of the Greek translation has been adduced from the Qumran finds.

Between the Wady Qumran, where the first discovery was made, and the Wady Murabbaat there lies the Wady en Nar. In this region, at a site called today Khirbet Mird, a number of manuscripts from a considerably later period were discovered in 1952-53. They belong to the period of the fifth to eighth centuries A.D., according to reports. There are Arabic papyri, Greek manuscripts of the Gospels of Mark and John, and also of Acts and the Wisdom of Solomon. There are also other materials of great importance, especially for Semitic philology.

The discoveries in the Judean Desert did not consist entirely of manuscripts. There were pottery, coins, and other remains of settlement in the cave area. In particular, however, the discoveries include excavation of the probable headquarters of the community which produced and hid away these manuscripts. The location of the site is Khirbet Qumran, on the northwestern edge of the Dead Sea. Father de Vaux and his colleagues have been at work there since November, 1951, in a series of campaigns. The main building of the settlement is 118 by 94 feet. There were three major periods of occupancy, beginning in the last half of the second century B.C. The first period appears to have been brought to an end by an

earthquake. The second resumed in about 4 B.C., it is believed, and continued for a short time. Then the third settlement flourished in the early part of the first Christian century and came to an end about A.D. 69, no doubt as a part of the Roman victory over the Jewish rebels.

The settlement at Khirbet Qumran was a sizable one. It was not, apparently, a place of residence, but rather a meeting place of the group. One room is a scriptorium, in which some of the manuscripts were probably produced. There is a series of vats or baths in which the ritual lustrations of the group were observed. Nearby is the burial place of the group, consisting of more than 1,000 graves. Several of these had been examined in earlier periods; de Vaux and his fellow workers examined a number of them as well.

A great deal of pottery and a number of coins were found which fixed the dates of occupancy of the building. Included in the pottery discoveries was a whole jar of the type in which the manuscripts had been stored in the first cave. This was of importance both for the dating of the manuscripts and for the establishment of a relation between the group which had settled at Khirbet Qumran and the persons responsible for hiding the manuscripts in the caves nearby.

It is by no means certain that the treasures of the caves have been exhausted. It may be that other manuscripts and fragments are still in the hands of the Bedouin. It is also highly probable that other manuscripts are still hidden in other caves of the region. And beyond this, since the study of the manuscripts is at an early stage, we may anticipate additional disclosures as this work goes on. In the meantime, however, it is in order to deal with what we have and to attempt to draw some conclusions as to the date of the materials, their historical connections, and their significance.

#### THE DATE OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

We shall restrict our survey to the manuscripts and other materials from the Qumran region, since the other discoveries come from a different group and a different period, according to our present knowledge.

Several lines of evidence have been employed by which to fix the dates of the different manuscripts. Paleography (the study of the form and development of early writing) has not led to assured results, since the materials for a comparative study of the development of Hebrew writing are very sparse. The present conclusion of paleographers appears to be that the vast majority of the manuscripts belong within the period from the second century B.C. to the first century A.D., although there are dissenting

voices to be heard. The archeological evidence is believed by many scholars to be more conclusive. Coins and pottery from Khirbet Qumran fix the date of settlements there, as we have seen, to the same period to which the manuscripts are assigned. The excavation of the first cave led scholars to conclude that the manuscripts were put away in the Hellenistic period, but this conclusion has required modification. It is now believed that the manuscripts were hidden away in the period of the Jewish wars of A.D. 66-70. A few scholars still maintain that the manuscripts belong to the medieval period, but such a position appears to the present writer to be no longer defensible at all.

The form of the text in the biblical manuscripts has also been used to date them. This criterion is a very difficult one to apply, since we know so little about the evolution of the Hebrew text. There is a distinct difference in the spelling of the two Isaiah manuscripts. The complete one is written in the fuller form of vocalization of the early Hebrew manuscripts, similar to the form of spelling found in Ezra, Nehemiah, and the books of Chronicles. The fragmentary manuscript of Isaiah is written, however, with the more modest use of vowel signs characteristic of the received Hebrew text of most of the Old Testament. We must probably conclude, therefore, that the introduction of the 'aleph, he', waw and yodh as vowel-signs had already developed to a considerable extent when the manuscripts were written, but that some scholars or groups still preferred the older and more sparse use of these vowel-signs.

The relative date of the major manuscripts has been worked at a great deal. No definite conclusions are yet possible. Professor Millar Burrows<sup>1</sup> suggests the following order and dates:

1. Complete Isaiah manuscript and Manual of Discipline, about 100 B.C.
2. Habakkuk Commentary, last quarter of first century B.C.
3. War scroll, Thanksgiving Psalms, Genesis romantic commentary (called by him prior to its unrolling the Lamech Apocalypse), and the fragmentary Isaiah manuscript; first Christian century, and before A.D. 70.

#### THE OLD TESTAMENT TEXT

Of great significance is the question of how these newly discovered biblical manuscripts agree with the received Hebrew text. A few instances follow which indicate that, while there are some extremely important

<sup>1</sup> Burrows, M., *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 118-119.

variant readings, the received Hebrew text is in astonishing agreement with these manuscripts and fragments from a period almost a millennium earlier than the major Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament formerly available to us. Evidence for the history of the Old Testament text in Egypt and Palestine in pre-Christian centuries is also available as a result of the study of these manuscripts.

The complete Isaiah manuscript agrees with the received Hebrew text very closely. There are errors in significant number of the type expected in any manuscript: omissions, dittography, misspellings, and errors due to faulty reading and/or hearing. The form of spelling is of the type represented in the later Old Testament books, such as Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles. But there are several interesting readings which are to be preferred to those of the received text. In Isaiah 14:4, for example, the received text reads, "How the oppressor has ceased; how the golden city has ceased." The words "golden city" are a rendering of a strange form, *madhhebhah*, which in Aramaic might possibly have such a meaning. The newly discovered manuscript reads *marhebah*, "the insolent one," which provides a sensible and apt text. The error is a very common one, resting on the confusion between the *daleth* and the *resh*.

Isaiah 21:8 can only be translated from the received text, "And he cried, 'A lion,'" which of course is nonsense. The new manuscript has in place of *'aryeh*, a lion, the smooth reading, *haro'eh*, "And he who saw cried. . . ." A third instance of a meaningless text is found in Isaiah 49:24: "Can the prey be taken from the mighty, or the prey of a righteous one be rescued?" The new reading from the Isaiah manuscript is, instead of *tsaddiq*, *'arits*, the tyrant or despot. We should therefore read, "Can the prey be taken from the mighty, or the prey of a tyrant be rescued?"

The second Isaiah manuscript agrees in extraordinary detail with the received text. Two variant readings of some importance may be noted. In 38:14 the received reading is "O Lord, I am oppressed; be thou my security." This may be the correct reading, but the second Isaiah text reads, "O Lord, beloved of me (literally, affection is to me), be thou my security (*chash'qah-li* for *'ash'qah-li*)," which may be better. Another variant which does not change the translation occurs in 60:4. The usual translation is entirely correct, "And your daughters shall be borne on the arm (or side)." This rests, however, on an unusual rendering of the Hebrew root, *'amen*. The Isaiah manuscript reads *tinnaseynah*, which is precisely the word expected by the translation, "shall be borne."

Several variant readings appear in the commentary to the book of

Habakkuk. One of the most interesting occurs in 2:16. The received text reads, "Drink and be uncircumcised," an obvious error. The commentator has read, "Drink and stagger" (*wehēra 'ēl* instead of *wehē 'arel*). But in his comments on the text, he appears to know the reading "be uncircumcised"!

In the other fragments there are many interesting variant readings. Deut. 32:8 is found in the reading accepted long ago by critical scholars: "He fixed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the sons of God" (not "the sons of Israel," as the received text has it). Deut. 31:1 appears in the received text as follows: "And Moses went and spoke these words to all Israel." The context does not require Moses to go anywhere in order to speak to the people. The Greek text reads, "And Moses continued to speak these words to all Israel," which is precisely what we have in one of the Deuteronomy fragments (*wayyekal Mosheh ledhabber . . .*).

Several fragmentary texts from I Samuel have revealed a very close relation not to the received Hebrew text, but to the Greek translation. This fact supports the prior conclusions of scholars that the Greek of I Samuel is often to be preferred to the Hebrew.

These are only a few samples of how the new discoveries illuminate the text and the textual history of the Old Testament. Professor Burrows has listed a number of additional readings, including some of the above. The amazing fact is the extraordinary number of instances in which the received text is supported by these early manuscripts, which antedate the actual manuscripts formerly available to us by as much as 1,000 years. The texts are of even greater significance for the light they shed upon the history of the Hebrew text and the evolution of Hebrew spelling and writing.

#### HISTORICAL REFERENCES AND ALLUSIONS

The internal study of the manuscripts has led, quite naturally, to the most divergent conclusions. Some scholars assume that the allusions in the documents, in particular the Habakkuk Commentary, can be pinned directly to events of the second or the first centuries B.C. Others are a good deal more hesitant to make such identifications. In what follows we shall attempt to state the more likely possibilities and to draw some conclusions from them.

The documents speak of a Teacher of Righteousness, a priest endowed with the power to carry on the tradition of the prophets and to describe the events of the latter days of history. This man met opposition in particular from a Wicked Priest who persecuted the Teacher and his followers.

The Teacher led his followers into the true way of the Covenant and appears to have been responsible for either the founding or the reconstitution of a Community of the Covenant, from which the manuscripts have come. Some scholars have claimed that the Teacher was put to death by the Wicked Priest and that he was expected to rise from the dead, or had arisen, soon to appear in glory. Such conclusions are based upon very questionable readings of certain words, particularly in the Habakkuk commentary, and upon what is probably a substitution of the Teacher for the Wicked Priest in one crucial passage of the Commentary. No more is clear from the documents on this point than that the Teacher was persecuted by the Priest. He may have been put to death, but this is nowhere explicitly stated.

The attempt to identify the historical setting of the manuscripts has led to no definite conclusions as yet. One must be ready at least to distinguish between the time of the founding of the community and the historical references (if there are any) in the commentary and in other documents. The major interpretations place the founding of the community either in the second century B.C. or in the first. If the second century is the time of the founding of the group, certain events reflected in the documents might still come from the first century. At the present time I find it easier to relate the apparent historical references to the first century B.C. The references to the "Kittim" in the Commentary better fits the Romans than the Seleucids, in my judgment. But this does not mean that the Teacher and the Wicked Priest can easily be identified from the period of the Roman invasion under Pompey in 63 B.C. André Dupont-Sommer (of the Sorbonne) and others have concluded that the Teacher was some unknown personality from the end of the second century or the beginning of the first, whose death occurred prior to the Roman invasion. The Wicked Priest is identified by Dupont-Sommer with Aristobulus II (67-63 B.C.).<sup>2</sup> In line with the careful argument of Professor Burrows, I believe that the only plausible historical allusion in the documents is the identification of the Kittim with the Romans. Other figures and events are so shadowy as to entitle us to no reliable conclusions as yet.

#### BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF THE COMMUNITY

By far the most significant aspect of the discoveries for the Christian and Jewish faiths is the light shed on the life of a group of Jews just

<sup>2</sup> See A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford University Press, 1952, p. 35. The author's views are clarified and elaborated in his later publication, *The Jewish Sects of Qumran and the Essenes*, London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., 1954.

before and during the first Christian century. This question may be separated entirely from the rather dubious attempts to see in the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness a prefiguring of Jesus of Nazareth, although if such a prefiguring could be demonstrated, this would be of very great significance indeed. The fact is that there is no such parallel unless one resorts to difficult allusions in the Testament of Levi and the Damascus Document, and reads the text of the Habakkuk commentary in the manner of a Dupont-Sommer—a manner which sober scholarship can in no sense defend.

The Manual of Discipline provides, with the Damascus Document, the most detailed picture of the inner life of the community. It is a very specific rule of life which is laid down there, closely paralleled by the descriptions which we have of the Essenes in Josephus, Philo of Alexandria, and Pliny. While the parallels are very impressive, they are not exact. Certain features of the life of the Essenes (e.g., their attitude toward marriage, the sacrificial system, and warfare) do not appear to have been shared by the Dead Sea group. It is perhaps best to assume, therefore, that the community represents a group very close to the Essenes but not necessarily identical with them. Professor Ralph Marcus has proposed with real plausibility the suggestion that they were a left-wing movement within Pharisaism.

More important for an understanding of the significance of the finds are the theological views of the community. One of the most striking features of the community's beliefs is the sharp contrast between the sons of light and the sons of darkness, between the men of the lot of Belial and those of the lot of God. There is also one reference to two spirits which were made for man, the spirits of truth and perversion, or of light and darkness. We also hear of the prince of lights and the angel of darkness. Some scholars have detected the influence of Gnosticism in these features of the scrolls. Burrows has indicated, however, that these and other apparently Gnostic elements need not be understood as Gnostic at all. He grants that Iranian dualism may very well be responsible for the developments within late Judaism which are represented in the scrolls, but prefers to think that these features then pass on, on the one hand, into the New Testament, and on the other, into Gnosticism.

One of the most characteristic aspects of Gnostic thought is the notion of the soul as a divine spark, imprisoned within fleshly existence, from which it is to be freed by the appearance of a divine redeemer. There is not a line in the scrolls as published to date which contains or implies this Gnostic understanding.

What light is shed by the documents upon the New Testament? Here again the judicious observations of Burrows are to be noted. He finds very little of basic significance in the scrolls for the New Testament scholar, apart from the new knowledge of the period in which the New Testament was produced. It is highly important, of course, to discover that the terms and imagery of the Johannine literature have their parallels in the scrolls. This may mean that the presumed Gnostic influence on this New Testament literature is not Gnostic at all, but rather a development out of later Judaism of imagery and terms found now in the scrolls. Prior to the new discoveries, this position had already been adopted by some scholars. Other parallels between sayings in John's Gospel and in the scrolls are quite close indeed, but they are not the sort which appear to be direct borrowings.

It has been suggested that John the Baptist was an Essene or perhaps even a member of the Qumran community. While this is not impossible, there is certainly no evidence to support the contention. The baptism of John and his summons to repentance are perhaps influenced by the community of the scrolls. The ritual washings, or baptisms, of the group may occupy an intermediate position between proselyte baptisms of the Jewish community and the baptism of repentance practiced by John. It is virtually certain that John knew of the existence of the covenant community, since his ministry was carried on only a few miles distant from their settlement.

There are some sayings in the scrolls which are very similar to sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. This is no more than one might expect to find, but as Burrows has observed, there are no parallels so close as those between certain teachings of Jesus and those found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. It has long been recognized that the Last Supper has developed out of some form of a Jewish meal. The community of the scrolls also prescribes the form of a communal meal which has its similarities with the Last Supper ceremony. "And when they set the table to eat, or the wine to drink, the priest shall stretch out his hand first to pronounce a blessing with the first portion of the bread and wine." But it is clear that the similarities are hardly as impressive as the differences.

The New Testament community may very well have been influenced by the community of Qumran. The two communities are, however, by nature of decidedly different types. The New Testament disciples were no esoteric group bent upon faithfulness to the Law and withdrawal from the world. They were sent out into the world with a mission to fulfill. Here are no secret teachings, no exclusion of women from the inner life

of the fellowship, no justification by works *and* by faith in a Teacher of Righteousness, no strictly circumscribed ritual or communal practices.

One interesting feature of the life of the Qumran community is its annual renewal of the covenant. We do not have the complete ritual of covenant renewal, but we do have frequent references to this practice and some blessings and curses which belong to the Old Testament ceremony. Scholars have observed that in the Old Testament some periodic renewal of the covenant between God and his people is to be presumed, although the support for such a thesis has been gathered together from various texts, all of them less than explicit. This is one of the lines of investigation of the Old Testament which may be illuminated significantly by a study of the new finds. To my knowledge, it has not yet been undertaken.

The discoveries are of very great significance for the student of the Bible. Their importance for Jewish and Christian theology should not be minimized, but they are of even greater weight for the historian and the philologist. From these historical and linguistic studies, much of theological significance is certain to emerge. No good end is served, however, by rash and premature statements of a "revolution" in Jewish or Christian theology. If a revolution results, by all means let it come. But let it be based on an accurate reading of the texts and on a sober analysis of their actual meanings.

#### FOR FURTHER READING

In addition to the works by Burrows and Dupont-Sommer referred to above, the following deserve special mention:

Edmund Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. A superb account of the discovery and contents of the Scrolls by a non-specialist. Certain conclusions of the author as to the significance of the documents for Jewish and Christian beliefs are dubious, to say the least.

H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952. The title of this study is a bit misleading. While it deals with the Zadokite Fragments in detail, it is actually a fully documented examination of a large number of the most crucial questions raised by the new discoveries.

William F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands*. A separate printing by the Biblical Colloquium, Pittsburgh, Pa., of Professor Albright's revised supplementary article under this title in *Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1955). Chapters XXIII-XXIV, pp. 122-136 contain the discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

# What Do Our Church Buildings Say?

JOHN R. SCOTFORD

ONCE I SPENT an idle hour looking at the old homes in the center of Providence, Rhode Island, and attempting to figure out what sort of a family would choose to live in each type of house. A similar approach applied to our church buildings will yield considerable amusement, but at the same time offer many clues to the religious life of the past and present.

Except in the earliest days in New England, our churches have been built with voluntary gifts, and usually these have come from a considerable group of people. It can be assumed that they approved of that to which they gave their substance. Nearly all of our church buildings have been the result of a group judgment. By studying what they built we can discover much concerning what they thought and even felt.

On the practical side this is obvious. Because they are long-lived, our older churches tell us how carpenters and bricklayers plied their trade one hundred, even two hundred years ago. A climb up under the rafters can be most revealing. Apparently the people who built covered bridges also worked on churches. They also reflect the social stratifications and folkways of the past.

The connection between the churches people built and their theological convictions is a fascinating study. Today many people fail to see any connection between church architecture and theology. At a recent meeting of the Church Building Bureau of the National Council of Churches there were in attendance representatives of the Church of God, the Church of the Nazarene, the Unitarians, and the Missouri Synod Lutherans, while in the past the Southern Baptists have often been on hand. All of these groups refrain from joining the National Council on theological grounds, but they assume that they can discuss ways of building without compromising their convictions. That is because the theology of architecture is implicit rather than explicit. The suppositions behind a building may be more revealing

---

JOHN R. SCOTFORD, B.D., D.D., former Congregational pastor, board secretary and editor, is a church building consultant who has met with over 800 congregations in all major denominations and in all parts of the country. He is author of *The Church Beautiful* and *When You Build Your Church*; now resides in Mount Vernon, New York.

than the structure itself. On the other hand, the more intelligent church architects recognize the relation between theology and church building and are striving to relate the structure of a church to the convictions of the congregation. Their complaint is that the latter are often a bit fuzzy.

## I

The location of a church reflects the role which it was expected to play in the life of the community.

In Catholic countries the cathedral and the plaza are twins, with the bishop's palace a part of the façade. In this country the Roman Catholic Church is more likely to be conspicuous than central. It owns little downtown real estate but has a fine eye for high ground. Of St. Louis it has been said, "On every hilltop is a Catholic institution." When St. Patrick's Cathedral was built, Fifth Avenue was a quiet residential area without benefit of Radio City. In most American cities the Roman Catholic Church is on the periphery of community life but is definitely out to claim all the attention it can get. This is reflected in its choice of sites.

New England is the only section where Protestant churches are logically located, usually at the head of the village green, although echoes of this practice can be found in upstate New York and in Ohio's Western Reserve. This reflects the close relation between church and state and also the homogeneous character of the settlements. When there is only one church and everybody is supposed to attend it, the sensible procedure is to put it at the center of the community.

The central areas of most of our larger American cities were laid out during the middle years of the nineteenth century, when rugged individualism was rampant and churches were frankly and openly competitive. The gulf between the rich and the poor was then much greater than it is today. If a church desired to prosper, it had to go where the prosperous were. This meant on "the Avenue." Churches crowded close to one another on Fifth Avenue, New York; Euclid Avenue, Cleveland; Woodward Avenue, Detroit; and Michigan Avenue, Chicago. Possibly this was where souls in need of the gospel could be found, but it certainly was where the folks who had the money congregated. What has happened to these rows of churches is significant. At the turn of the century there were six churches on Chicago's Michigan Avenue between Twentieth and Twenty-sixth Streets; one remains. More recently three churches and one synagogue have departed from New York's Fifth Avenue between Twenty-ninth and Fifty-fifth Streets, leaving three Protestant churches and St. Patrick's

Cathedral. A similar exodus is taking place in Cleveland and Detroit. Churches which cater to the fashionable rarely stay put.

In the Midwest the courthouse square has been the focal point of church life. Most of the major denominations can be found either on the square or within one block of it. In these communities religion was a divisive force. It segmented the community. No church was really central, but all clustered about the center.

In our smaller cities the way the denominations have arranged themselves is revealing. Closest to the center are the churches with the broadest appeal—Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational. They assume that the one way to reach people is to put the church door right in their path. They are doubtful of their ability to attract the multitude very far from its usual haunts. Next are the more evangelistic groups—Baptist, Nazarene, Church of God. They flourish between the busy center and the well-to-do circumference. They are after the common people and expect them to go out of their way at the call of religion. Then come the racial groups and the exponents of peculiar doctrine. They assume that their people will go anywhere to worship at the ancestral shrine or to get the brand of theology which they want. One of Chicago's greatest Lutheran churches is in the middle of the block on a side street. It would seem that the price of real estate is the deciding factor with these groups. They are not location-conscious.

The Episcopalians wobble between the first and the third groups. In New York, Boston, Indianapolis they are at the center; but usually they are around the corner or in some quiet nook. They like to get a long way back from the street, suggesting that those who throng the sidewalks are not for them.

At present churches are scattering out. Whatever the facts may be, they have a horror of appearing competitive. They like at least to keep out of each other's sight.

The motor car has revolutionized the nature of church sites. Before people can be gotten through the doors of a church they must first dispose of the cars that brought them there. As only the aged churchgoers know how to walk, this means that there must be adequate parking near at hand. This calls for a lot of land, yet with a motor car it does not make much difference just where that land is located. For new churches the accepted minimum is three acres. Old churches moving out are acquiring really large tracts. The extreme example of this is the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tennessee, where a major portion of the congregation has

moved from the dinginess of the center of a soft-coal city to fifty-five acres on the verdant circumference, where they will ultimately have everything but a golf course. Along with larger sites is coming the campus-style church with a number of buildings, which may be quite scattered, rather than the piled up edifice of the past.

What do these changes mean? The implication is that everyone owns a car. Aside from the aged, and the inhabitants of our largest cities, this is substantially so. (New York City has the lowest proportion of cars to population in the entire country.) Driving to church tends to minimize the importance of the neighborhood. As soon as one gets into a car, the choice of a place of worship is extended almost indefinitely. Churches are selected on the basis of congeniality rather than propinquity. "Community" means less and less. The automobile is probably increasing the class stratification of Protestantism.

But larger sites have their virtues. The public has more respect for a church spread over three acres than for one that is huddled on a sixty-foot lot. Instead of intruding on its neighbors, such a church dominates the scene. The church is well insulated against any possible deterioration of the neighborhood. Both the cost of land and the lack of available space will discourage the coming of other congregations. It is a far call from fashionable streets lined with churches opening directly from the sidewalk to our new places of worship set well back from the highway and approached over one-way drives leading to ample parking areas. Does this symbolize the larger place the church is occupying in American life?

## II

The site is something which a congregation selects; a building is something which it creates, and may be even more revealing of its inner life.

The New England meetinghouse is the most admired product of American church architecture. This is due in part to their superb settings, but is also the result of their utter simplicity, and the glory of white paint. In one sense they are a contradiction. The men who built them were opposed to anything suggesting religious symbolism and achieved complete success in making their interiors almost stupidly plain. Yet these same men put over their meetinghouses the most glorious steeples that the world has even seen—and the only possible justification for these fingers pointing upward is their symbolic value. The principle of suggesting God through material means was pitched out the window, but it landed on the roof.

The interior of these meetinghouses was entirely utilitarian. They were a place where the people could quite literally "sit under preaching." Today we wonder at their size, and imagine that our fathers were better churchgoers than are we (a false assumption). Here again the explanation is quite mundane. The churches were commonly financed by selling pews, and maintained by assessments. There are still churches in New England which are run by the "assessors." The idea behind large churches was not to shelter large crowds, but to provide plenty of pews so that there would also be plenty of money.

This system had two unfortunate consequences. The prosperous reserved the best seats for themselves, while the not-so-prosperous were relegated to the balcony. Even after these social distinctions had faded, a sense of proprietorship remained, and this has often continued into the present. Instead of the congregation belonging to the church, the church belonged to the congregation. Instead of thinking of the church as an institution which spoke to them, they thought of it as something with which they could do as they pleased. Architecturally, this has had most unfortunate results. About every other generation has "modernized" these old churches, and usually made them worse in the process. Tin ceilings and golden oak pews represented current taste!

Theologically, we suspect that a parallel can be discerned between Calvinism and the straight lines of our older churches. These were undoubtedly stiff, but they were also strong. The meetinghouse had better theological foundations than many of the "styles" which have followed it.

The auditorium-type church which flourished in the late nineteenth century is a lineal descendant of the meetinghouse. The guiding thought was to get as many people as possible within church walls for special occasions. Some of these were religious, such as the high school baccalaureate and the meeting of the conference; others were quite secular, such as commencements of all sorts, lyceum courses, concerts, entertainments which might be quite dramatic. In addition to the fixed pews other rooms could be opened up by means of movable partitions to give "the biggest auditorium in town." During this period the church was losing its old authority and was becoming anxious to commend itself as a useful institution which could take in anything short of a political convention. Today the auditorium church is the most difficult to adapt to current conceptions of worship.

Another direct descendant of the meetinghouse is the Greek revival church. As the New Englanders grew more sophisticated, they dressed up their churches with porticoes and columns. The people who found

names for the towns in upstate New York and in large areas of the South drew heavily on classical sources, and took the architecture along with the nomenclature. The Greek influence began as a means of beautification but it was later corrupted into a prime means of making a building outwardly impressive, and as such was taken over by court houses, libraries, banks, and railroad stations.

The ecclesiastical results of this trend have been various. In New England may be found chaste Greek temples, such as the First Congregational Church in Burlington, Vermont, which serve rather demurely as Christian churches. In the South and somewhat in the West are many Greek-derived churches which were built primarily to impress their neighbors. Their strutting columns, their wide stone steps, their soaring domes make them look larger than they really are. Inner usefulness has commonly been sacrificed to outward pomp and circumstance. To Christianize or even to humanize these tombs is a most difficult problem. The truth is that they are inherently pagan, and resist Christian baptism.

Theologically, in this country Greek architecture originally had some connection with rationalistic thought. Most of the really old Unitarian churches are in this style. In its later phases it represents a more or less unconscious desire to convince the man on the street that the church is a mighty institution.

Most of the churches now in use were built between 1880 and 1910—when American architecture was at its lowest ebb. They may fairly be described as nondescript, with Gothic trimmings. They range from the cozy to the fantastic. Theologically this was a period of floundering. The authority of a literally inspired Bible and of the close-knit Calvinistic creeds which were supposed to cover everything was waning. Theology itself was in disrepute. One result was that when people undertook to build churches there was no pattern and they felt free to follow their whims and fancies. Two influences appear to have shaped the result.

Church people were anxious to get away from the stiffness of the old meetinghouses. They developed a horror of straight lines. Quite a few simple but admirable old buildings were pulled down and replaced with "modern" churches. Where this was not possible, straight pews were taken out and curving ones put in. The oldest Protestant congregation in the original Northwest Territory erected a church in Marietta, Ohio, in which the degrees of curvature reached astronomical figures. The aim seems to have been to achieve a fine state of easy relaxation when one went to church.

These nondescript churches were unconsciously humanistic. Their

builders had never heard of that word, but they labored to make man loom large and to reduce God to manageable proportions. There is no air of mystery and little appeal to imagination in these churches. The scale emphasizes the human personality. Each worshiper makes an entrance. The curving pews make it possible for each person to see everybody else—and to be seen by them. The center of attention is the minister seated on a pompous chair with the four horsemen of the apocalypse behind him in the choir loft. In such a place it is far easier to think about the virtues and the foibles of one's fellow men than to concentrate the mind on God. However, these churches commonly have a fluidity which make them easier to improve so far as their interiors are concerned than are the ecclesiastical auditoriums and the Greek temples which have come down to us. Their exteriors are hopeless. Although they "look like churches" they surely do not commend our faith to the passersby. One of the rarest things in America is a really attractive old church.

The period between the first world war and the depression was a time of groping in the life of the churches. They suffered from both an inferiority complex and a great yearning.

Never were the churches more anxious to be plain useful. They sought to justify their existence by becoming the rather abject servants of the community. This had its intellectual climax in the Community Church movement, which thought of the gospel as a sort of overtone to stepped-up neighborliness. Churches plunged into debt that they might build gymnasiums with which to coax youth within their walls. The minister joined everything that he might commend himself to everybody. He ran errands endlessly. The church came perilously close to accepting current standards and becoming little more than a social institution.

But this was also a time of yearning. The people craved something which they did not have. They wanted to experience the presence of God. To this end they installed pipe organs and stained glass in their old churches and spent very considerable sums on new ones. Yet these stirrings were not strong enough to inspire the churches to seek new forms of architectural expression. They dared not trust their own judgment, and so leaned heavily on the experience of the past. During these years traditional church architecture had its last great fling. Those who had much money and a somewhat mystical faith built Gothic churches; those with less money and a more rational approach put up Georgian edifices with clear glass windows. This rather frantic pursuit of God through architecture reached a somewhat tragic climax in and about the University

of Chicago. During the twenties the Rockefeller Chapel, three churches, and a couple of seminary chapels were built—and none have proven really satisfactory from either the utilitarian or the worship point of view. The desire was there, the money was available, but the confidence born of clearly conceived theological convictions was lacking.

### III

Between the fall of 1929 and the summer of 1945 the minimum number of churches were built. Since then has ensued the greatest building boom that the American churches have ever known. In 1956 it is estimated that \$900,000,000 will be spent on religious buildings in this country. Although conventional churches are still being built in the conventional way, three irresistible forces are leading to the development of a new church architecture.

The first is economic. At a time when the need is greatest, the costs are also the highest. Building dollars must be stretched as never before. But rising prices have not been uniform. Wages have gone up far more than materials, while new ways of building have been developed which are less costly than old methods. Economy is achieved by holding the labor on the site to the absolute minimum, by the use of prefabricated materials, and by a general willingness to walk in new ways. Few churches can now afford the elaborate detail of the Gothic or even the wedding-cake ornamentation of the Georgian. The most compelling argument for a new architecture is the necessity of getting a roof over the heads of a congregation for a price that it can afford to pay.

Among sophisticated circles at least the traditional styles have been laughed out of court. Modern Gothic has been seen for what it is—plain fakery. The folly of seeking to clothe the faith of today in the garments of yesterday is becoming increasingly apparent.

The principle that great architecture rests back on clearly held convictions is becoming obvious. The most daring—and successful—builders of churches today are the Roman Catholics and the Missouri Synod Lutherans, and they are the people who know just what they believe. The facts seem to be that the weaker the theology the more timid the architecture; the more firmly held the theology, the greater the willingness to take a chance on new ways of building.

The aim of the new architecture is to create an impressive place of worship. It has been far more successful with its interiors than with its exteriors. For that reason we will postpone our consideration of it until

we have retraced our steps and traced the development of the worship features of the American churches.

Protestant worship in this country began with the voice of the preacher, who proclaimed the gospel wherever he could be heard. The next step was to get a roof under which a congregation could meet, with the minister still the center. Musical instruments were scarce on the frontier and trained singers scarcer. The choir slipped into the church gradually, usually at the rear of the congregation and in a balcony, if there was one.

The pipe organ changed this. These instruments cost quite a bit, and the people who gave wanted something to see as well as something to hear for their money. They also felt that the front of the church was often a bare and uninteresting place. So the organ and the choir moved down in front as a background for the preacher. The problem of getting better music was easily solved by hiring a quartet, which had the added advantage of not taking up much room. This arrangement continued unquestioned until the twenties, when it was abandoned so far as new churches were concerned, and it has been increasingly superseded by the remodeling of old ones.

Why the passing of the central pulpit? Theologically it stood for the open Bible and the preacher as the proclaimers of God's truth. Early in this century the churches began to discover that the Bible was something less than a direct transcript of the Divine Will, and that an intelligent understanding required considerable interpretation. The minister could no longer open the book and say, "Thus saith God." It also became apparent that, while the minister might be the Divine mouthpiece, most of the time his voice was quite human, and there was usually more of his personality than of Divine revelation in what he had to say. Over against this was an increasing emphasis on the Lord's Supper as the central act in church life, and a desire to elevate the communion table so that it was something more than a low projection in front of the pulpit. Chorus choirs were coming in, which required much more space than did the quartet. The congregation objected to being stared at by the singers, with the choir was sometimes troubled by the scrutiny which they received from the pews. A more fundamental objection was sometimes sensed; that the choir, and even the minister when facing the congregation, were putting on a performance rather than leading in Christian worship. Less articulate was the desire for a stronger, more dramatic center of attention than a pulpit with three chairs behind it.

The Episcopal Church offered an arrangement for worship which seemed to overcome these difficulties: the pulpit moved to one side with a lectern on the other, the choir sitting sideways to the congregation facing itself, the communion table against the wall with either a reredos or a dossal behind it. It was assumed that whatever the Episcopal Church did was historically sound and liturgically correct. Nonliturgical Protestant congregations followed their example in headlong fashion. The result was undoubtedly an improvement over that which it displaced: the minister was removed from the continuing center of attention, the choir no longer confronted the congregation, while the communion table was given an appropriate setting. More room was provided for the singers and more movement introduced into the worship. These changes were justified on the grounds that the church is primarily a fellowship which had its earthly climax around the table of our Lord and which has experienced its holiest moments about that table down the ages, and that therefore the table rather than the pulpit should stand at the center of Protestant worship.

This "divided chancel" arrangement, as it was commonly called, was not without its difficulties. Choirs commonly objected to being divided. If the two parts sat close enough together to sing as one, they blocked the view of the communion table for many of the people in the pews. If the choir was sufficiently separated so that everybody could see the table all the time, they found it difficult to sing as a unit. Meanwhile, historical research showed that this arrangement lacked the historical basis which it was assumed to have. Antiphonal choirs were developed for the use of singing and chanting monks in the university and monastic establishments of the middle ages. There were no divided choirs in the parish churches of England prior to the Reformation. We do not know why the practice had such universal acceptance in the Episcopal churches of this country. It looks as if every parish expected to grow up into a cathedral. The original pattern of what has become the common chancel may be seen in the chapels of the General and the Philadelphia Seminaries of the Episcopal Church, St. Paul's School (Concord, New Hampshire), and Bowdoin College. In these instances the choir is the church.

The Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church promises to have an increasing influence on Protestantism. Its major aim is to secure the active participation of the congregation in the Mass. To this end it is reducing to a minimum the distance between the people and the altar. In St. Mark's Church, Burlington, Vermont, and the Church of the

Blessed Sacrament in Holyoke, Massachusetts, the people completely surround the altar. In the latter church it is impossible to sit more than eight pews back.

This point of view is being echoed in the Episcopal Church. With the choir sitting between the congregation and the altar, the communion often becomes a remote mystery in which the congregation has only a minor part. At this part in the service the choir is regarded as more of a nuisance than a help. The Lutherans have quite generally kept the choir out of the chancel, and the Episcopalians are beginning to follow their example. A Southern architect reports, "I am kept busy putting choirs into the chancels of Methodist and Presbyterian churches and taking them out in Episcopalian churches." Choirs are returning to their original positions in the balcony and in the transepts, where the German churches have commonly had them all along. An Episcopal authority on such things reports, "Building churches in the shape of a cross was not done to inspire travelers by air or because this was supposed to be particularly holy, but so as to get a good place for the choirs."

At this point modern architecture and the liturgical development of Protestantism meet. Two men with quite un-American names have developed what promises to be a new pattern for our churches. They are the late Eliel Saarinen and Pietro Belluschi. Saarinen first enunciated the idea in the Christian Church in Columbus, Indiana, and refined it in Christ Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod) in Minneapolis, while Belluschi has elaborated it in a group of churches around Portland, Oregon.

The root idea is to use the front (or ecclesiastical East) wall of the church as the background for a large and somewhat realistic cross. This wall is high-lighted by windows on either side which flood the cross and table with natural sunlight. The austerity of the setting is relieved by the use of greenery—ivy, ferns, potted plants. The effect is most dramatic. The cross is the dominant feature of the room.

Variations of this arrangement are being developed by other architects in many sections of the country. Through utter, almost stark simplicity, combined with God's natural light and God's growing things man is brought into the presence of the cross. The human is minimized, the divine magnified. This expresses the mood of much current theological thought. For the moment, and in some quarters, the convictions of the church and the fabric of her structure are more in harmony than they have been for many years.

How the exterior of our churches can bear testimony to the faith of

those who worship within their walls is an unsolved problem. Far more people see the outside of a church than ever pass through its doors. Here is its largest potential congregation. The form of the building should say something to them which they cannot miss. This is difficult. Most of these passersby are architecturally illiterate and have a most limited religious vocabulary. They ask that "a church look like a church," which means that it should remind them of some other church which they have sometime seen. The one symbol which all will accept is the steeple, but for most congregations that is impossibly expensive, and also quite unsuited to many locations.

Attempts have been made to baptize modern architecture into the church by attaching an oversize cross to a pylon or even to a camouflaged chimney. But a cross should never be stuck on; it should grow out of something. In the Cabrini Roman Catholic Church in Minneapolis the cross grows out of the double doorway of the entrance. We have seen it both recessed into and projecting out of the end wall of a church in a way that seemed structurally sound.

Possibly the dictum, "Let the church be the church," has an architectural as well as a theological application. We believe that the best symbol for a church is the form of the building itself. The rigid frame construction and the laminated wood arch are giving us a considerable height at not too great an expense. The Oneonta Church of South Pasadena, California, has a lofty roof but cost only sixty-five cents a cubic foot, which is very low. On the inside there is the same upthrust of the best Gothic, only achieved in an entirely honest way. On the outside the roof rises above the surrounding homes—as a church should.

We are in the midst of a theological renaissance. The church is bent on clarifying its thought. Theologians have become unexpectedly popular. At the same time circumstances have opened the door for a new day in church building. Thanks to the mobility which the automobile has brought to American life, a large proportion of our churches must move to new locations or else fade away. Most of our old churches are ugly, even when looked at through eyes of love, and ill-suited to the needs of today. Increasing costs have made old ways of building impossible. Never did new religious conceptions, or at least freshly enunciated principles, have such an opportunity to express themselves in unfettered ways. Out of current theology should come a new church architecture.

# Church Building in 1956

## How Contemporary Can We Get?

JAMES R. BLACKWOOD

THIS CHURCH BUILDING BOOM has been blowing the lid right off the top of the graph. Jews, Catholics, Protestants, the conglomeration of sects—all have felt themselves to be the victims of a housing shortage. In 1954 the religious bodies of America invested more than \$593,000,000 in expansion or in putting up new structures; in 1955 about \$750,000,000; one guess for 1956 pegs the amount at \$900,000,000; and the end is not yet in sight. There can be little question about the fact, we're in the biggest church building spree of all time.

At the end of the 1940's the editors of *Architectural Forum* could discern no "clear line of development" in recent church architecture. What they saw they labeled "anarchy in our churches." They asked: "Can today's church contribute importantly to today's architecture, as did the church in the past? Has contemporary architecture lost the power to create churches that will satisfy the spirit as well as the mind?" During the past few years, the editors of the same magazine have largely answered their own questions; a series of articles on new church construction indicates that religious folk are beginning to grow more venturesome in their building plans. Moreover, the December 1955 issue of *Architectural Forum* printed a scholarly round table discussion on "Theology and the Modern Church." A good many things have changed since 1949.

Actually all of the new church buildings that go up in 1956 will reflect "contemporary" influences, since they all belong to the same era. This is true in equal measure for those investors who want Georgian colonial, streamlined Gothic, or a slice of eternity kept under glass. For most people, however, C. Harry Atkinson strikes the contemporary note when he says: "Our churches are changing—new opportunities plus new methods add up to a new look." In order to understand the new look in American churches, particularly those that move within the Protestant

---

JAMES R. BLACKWOOD, B.D., Th.M., is minister of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, located on the campus at the College of Wooster in Wooster, Ohio.

tradition, it will help to catch a glimpse of what architects are designing for other types of buildings.

## I

Eliel Saarinen uses familiar words to describe modern architects. He separates them into two main groups, the *romanticists* and the *classicists*. Any such classification proves slippery in handling, yet these terms are understood well enough to be suggestive. Broadly speaking, the romanticist lays claim to local materials and resources; strives to give an individual flourish to each project; believes in giving imagination free utterance. The classicist, on the other hand, prefers to concentrate on formal dignity, simplicity, correctness of proportion and nicety of detail within an accepted mode or pattern. The two styles are not necessarily at odds, despite what a few of the stylists say about each other's work.

In one of its many forms, romantic architecture has joined the back-to-nature movement. Cities are obsolete. Their streets are clogged sewers; their offices and factories are spiritual prisons; their homes are coffins above ground, New Orleans style. The twentieth-century romanticist snaps at the lure of nature. His work blends into its environment. He lets his rock wall creep out from a slope of land. He straddles his dwelling across a brook. His colors belong to the earth, and he often chooses shaggy textures that cling to the ground as if by "the ten-fingered grasp of reality." This architecture is woodsy yet dependent on the tools and skills of industrialization; folksy yet sophisticated; loaded sometimes with whimsy yet stressed to bear the load.

Taking another form, the romantic strain of individualism accounts for that marvel, the Guggenheim Museum for non-objective art in Manhattan. Frank Lloyd Wright hates boxes. Space is the "continual becoming," he explains, and it just doesn't come in boxes. He therefore originally proposed a museum that would look like a huge coiled spring, and function like one, too, though with a minimum of bounce. There would be no continuous vertical wall, no hidden upright columns within—the weight of the building would be carried by the outside wall, transferred to the foundations around and around the descending spiral. This un-chambered nautilus would offer, in the architect's words, "one great space on a single continuous floor." There would be no cellular hive of boxed-in rooms, no windows punched through walls, no doors or connecting corridors (because everything would be already connected), and no stairs. The visitor would feel no abrupt changes but would be gently led up a curved

ramp inside the spiral, never "in" or "out," but gliding, rather, in smooth, helical transitions from space to space.

Contrasted to the wonderfully unpredictable shapes fashioned by the romantic architect, the classicist may be said to represent "the esthetic of restraint." He produces nothing quixotic. He distills ideas so that a structure rises at last in purified, crystalline clarity, with nothing in excess. This order of thought chimes well with the present economic urge to build something monumental in size. The classicist believes in the city. Out of its cluttered habits he hopes to raise the symbol of precision and beauty made possible by machines. Thus he draws a rectilinear pattern in depth, which becomes a framework of steel. He gives a silhouette to his building as sharp as the cutting edge of a giant lathe. Often he uses the plain surface in its most polished and transparent form, the sheet of glass. In other words, the classicist points his thought toward the clean, taut, bare expression of structural principles. He learns to use the watchword, "Less is more."

Do the present buildings of the classicists and romanticists harmonize or merely speed the clash of head-on opinions? Can the architects themselves learn to tolerate each other? That is debatable. Yet the two forms of architecture, the classic and the romantic, stand side by side in one of the most photographed spots in the world today. Along the East River in New York the Secretariat of the United Nations rises straight and clear-cut into the sky, terse and symmetrical, unadorned; next to it the General Assembly, with its "drawn-in middle and flaring corners, its scooped roof surmounted by a blister dome," sets the counterpoint in size and mass and sweep that makes for the harmony of contrast. There are those who call these buildings the twin abortions of modern architecture. But others of us respect them for what they are as well as what they represent, mistakes and all—the fragile hope that through tolerance and acceptance the world may learn the arts of peace.

## II

Whatever else may be said about romanticism and classicism (with their constant interplay and their strange mutations), this much should be firmly said: most of the buildings put up in the last ten years are on their way out, no matter what their styles may be. Across the face of each one ripples the canceled stampmark, *mid-twentieth century*. Engineering and scientific research are bound to change the look of coming things.

Nevertheless we must ask again what the churches are contributing

to the architecture of today, apart from several hundred million dollars and perhaps as many firm opinions about what makes a church "look like a church." How contemporary can we get in church building?

Surprisingly, new techniques may rejuvenate cast-off ideas. About the time we convince ourselves that marble won't do for modern structures, thin marble slabs turn out to be an excellent material for curtain walls. When we learn to think of domes as antiquated, Buckminster Fuller tats a lacework of metal that would cover almost all outdoors, if he kept on tatting. As soon as we start to agree that "nobody can afford to build Gothic nowadays," the forest industries market laminated wood arches, Pietro Belluschi conceives a dollar-saving church in Portland, Oregon, in which the pointed arches actually bear the roof load—and everybody stops to reconsider. The day one begins to suppose that the groined vault belongs to the Middle Ages, he picks up a magazine and learns that the exquisite new airport building in St. Louis, designed by Yamasaki, has a groined vault of shell concrete.

Take a closer look at that airport building. Quite incidentally, from an incoming airplane each of its three present sections is cruciform. This illustrates the architect-engineer's practical desire to erect a lighter, tighter structure, not his quest for a symbol. Long ago the roof of the Gothic cathedral thrust out immense lateral pressures that were offset by buttresses. The contours of shell concrete, however, are so bent as to develop exceptionally low moments of stress. The egg one eats for breakfast (as every egghead knows) has a stiff shell. It is stiffened not so much by weight or thickness; it is stiffened by shape. Similarly, shell concrete gains coherence by its shape. It scatters the impact of a sudden load in all directions. Indeed, too much bulk unbalances the structure. A thicker shell brings on initial problems of shrinkage and cracking, and the constant accordion push and pull of changes in temperature. A 120-foot span of shell concrete may be about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches thick or thin, whichever word applies.

Another experiment in "strength with lightness" is called the "space frame." Metal parts for this frame are cheaply manufactured, easily assembled by unskilled labor, quickly dismounted and reassembled, and yet amazingly durable and shock-resistant. Struts of metal are bolted together horizontally and diagonally through connecting plates. As in the concrete shell—and Ephesians 4:25b—the load is equally distributed. No single member buckles until every other member has been forced to its

elastic limit. This is not merely a draftboard pipe dream. Citizens of Wayne, Michigan, are buying a space frame for their Monroe School addition. Their plan yields the fourfold advantage of low first cost, brief construction time, simple maintenance, and boy-proof ruggedness. What's more, if the members of the school board find the density of student population shifting, they can fold up the walls of their schoolhouse, take its frame apart, and quickly put the whole thing back together on another lot, with loss of only the roofing material!

Here is something for church extension boards to ponder. The space frame may be one answer to problems in an area like that along the St. Lawrence seaway, where the church must act quickly, if at all, to reach a laboring population in flux. Again, here is a device to capture the imagination of do-it-yourself suburbanites—a kind of oversize, extra-dimensional Tinker Toy, which will satisfy their craving for a Sunday church school as approachable as the drive-in bank and as trim as the elementary school in their neighborhood.

Just as the "Chapel on Wheels" has given effective aid in rural work, there is a possibility of achieving much greater flexibility, mobility, and economy than we now have in city church planning. Could a number of established congregations, say in California, pool resources and buy a space frame? Erected for a young church until its members could build for themselves, this knockdown structure would then be moved into the next outbreak of subdivisions. Vigorous churches have begun their life in all sorts of temporary shelters—tents, basements, theaters, mortuaries, fire-houses, beerhalls. How many young churches feel the stimulus that the latest engineering techniques can give?

Shell concrete and the metal space frame represent only two advances, among many others, in creating structures that are primarily *in tension*. This key word, *tension*, is the common factor in experiments that follow straight, sharp lines, as well as those that swoop off into warped surfaces that never knew the T-square. *Architectural Forum* predicts that when molecules of plastic are stiffened with catalytic action or gamma radiation, buildings will be rustproof and fire resistant; lighter, tougher, relatively less costly and certainly more colorful than those of today; as opaque, translucent, or transparent as desired; and ever so much more *in tension* than now. Neo-orthodox theologians will be glad to hear this; the homiletical bonus looks promising. The old sermon will do for years to come, with, of course, a little freshening of the illustrations.

We know in part, we prophesy in part. But this much we know for

sure: the future will be different from what we are thinking now, and in the Providence of God, infinitely more various.

### III

During the early decades of the twentieth century the Protestant churches of North America were seeking a symbol. One of the leaders in the search gave it a name; he called it "The Gothic Quest."

The energies of two men in particular sum up the Gothic boom of that era. The first of these, Ralph Adams Cram, was the Isaiah of the movement. He had a vision. He reasoned that it would be absurd to build an Ionic can opener, a Byzantine telephone, or a Tudor submarine. None the less Cram argued that Gothic has been and ought to remain the special idiom for expressing the genius of two institutions, the university and the church. Hence the graduate school at Princeton: the foliated tower, the commons with its huge open fireplace, the bowling green (with a statue of a dean irresponsibly plunked in the middle of it.) Hence, too, the majestic fabrics of Calvary Church in Pittsburgh, Fourth Presbyterian in Chicago, St. Paul's in Detroit, and The Church of the Covenant in Cleveland. Such were the visions that Ralph Adams Cram turned into stone, wood, and glass, while yet preserving the spaciousness and awe of a dream.

If Cram spoke as the Isaiah of the Gothic movement, the second person, Elbert M. Conover, was its Elijah—a fiery prophet. As chairman of the committee on architecture for the Federal Council of Churches, he stormed at the drabs whose impromptu ramblings disgraced divine worship, and he came close to calling down fire from heaven on architects who went along with that sort of thing. This man's influence did much to alter the outline and rhythm of Protestant worship in the United States. For Sunday morning he insisted on dignity and reverence, mediated through certain symbols of church tradition. Between Sundays, he blasted away at ecclesiastical eyesores.

That choir, for example, lined up where the congregation must watch the gum-chewing soprano, the winking tenor, the giggling alto, the slumbering bass—those curved pews—that sloping floor—this big, awkward sliding partition—these had to go, all of them! And they *did* go. A city congregation could take pride in its large Gothic edifice, but in the smaller town as well, the flock would echo the prevailing sense of fitness by building what looked like an English parish church. Narrow the nave, straighten the pews, split the chancel, set the pulpit over here, a lectern over there,

divide the choir and face its members in toward each other, move the communion table to the far end of the chancel and call it, perhaps hesitatingly at first, an altar—these imperatives began to take hold of building committees everywhere. They have stuck with us. Elbert Conover was in no small part responsible for their tenacity. He exhorted a church to build Gothic if at all possible, Georgian colonial if necessary or convenient, and contemporary only in case of dire emergency.

Ironically, however, the annual Elbert M. Conover award has been going in these last few years to men who fashion the sort of buildings that Mr. Conover himself strongly censured. At the same time the *magnum opus* of Ralph Adams Cram, the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, has swollen into a good-sized headache for those who must manage its finances. The vestry of St. John's is said to be thinking of plans that would break away from Gothic methods, and, in order to decrease brute tonnage and cost, finish the central tower in the contemporary idiom.

#### IV

Today the architect who agrees to design a church building ought to ask one question first of all. "How does this congregation worship?" Are the prayers formal and generalized; personal and extemporized; or a mixture of both? How large a part in worship does the congregation take? The choir? The minister? Does the church stress historical continuity, confessional agreement, or the moving experience of the Holy Spirit? Answers to these questions make a difference. Even in days when church members plan to spend more money on kitchen equipment than on an organ, worship remains the focal center of congregational life.

What architecture, then, is appropriate to worship in the mid-twentieth century? At present reckoning it would seem that the Gothic quest has ended in a bog. Yet the Gothic enthusiasts merely looked where they could find most symbols at hand; they by-passed the Reformation of the sixteenth century, stopped far short of the basilican tradition of the early Christian era, and lingered in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries when the mystic seed of symbolism flowered in northwestern Europe. They could have done worse.

All that went on in the medieval cathedral centered in the daily drama of the mass. The scholastic in his intellectual search for unity found an expression of it already created in the vast associational resonances of the liturgy. The poet sang of love that became manifest at the consecration of the elements—both the *Divina Commedia* and the ritual

of the church led up to a beatific vision, unfolding symbolically in *terza rima* or in transmuted light as the vision of the Celestial Rose. The unlettered artisan or peasant also came to worship. The mass and its mirror of stone, the cathedral, were meant to be "toke and boke to the leude peple that they may rede i' imagery and painture that clerkes rede i' the boke."

Everything had turned into multiple symbol, from the cruciform ground plan of the cathedral to the very mortar that held its stones in place. Every object attracted at least three interpretations, and generally more. Symbols kept changing their meanings throughout the year. At different seasons the altar represented the manger in Bethlehem, then Calvary, then the tomb in which the body of Jesus lay. During the mass the same altar at different moments symbolized the ark, the table of the Last Supper, the sacrificial heart. Down to the smallest accessories, every element in worship spoke a symbolic language, while the positions, gestures, tones, and garments of the priests all shuttled in and out to weave a rich pattern of suggestiveness.

But the leude peple's boke had become encyclopedic. Without being clearly explained or deeply felt, the intricate cross-references of the liturgy did as much to bewilder as to edify. Through the centuries that followed the waning of the Middle Ages, the men of the Renaissance did much to change the face of church building, but were somewhat less intent to change the shape of the liturgy. The Reformers, who did little to change the shape of the buildings in which they first met, did much to change the face of worship.

For example, although Martin Luther wished to avoid an abrupt break in the devotional habits of his people, he made bold experiments in the vernacular tongue that gave faith a voice in the worshiping congregation. He declared that ceremonies are to be given "the same place in the life of a Christian as models and plans have among builders and artisans. They are prepared not as permanent structures, but because without them nothing could be built or made." John Calvin took even more drastic steps than Luther in his reforms. He drew materials for worship from the Bible, yet he claimed no final wisdom for the particular forms he chose. In worship and discipline, he acknowledged that "one form would not be adapted to all ages."

Calvin shook off the traditional wraps of Roman Catholicism, not because he feared episcopacy as such, nor because he desired to worship in chilly abstraction, nor because he hated symbols. Quite the contrary—he

valued symbols. He and many of his followers asked, however, that a symbol be scriptural rather than merely colorful, clear rather than ambiguous, precise rather than ornate or sentimental. Apparently these reformers were trying to do for worship what the classicists are attempting in modern architecture—to eliminate, to simplify, and say what is meant without excess or frills, so that "less is more."

If no set form of worship is adapted to all ages, how much less ought Christians to try putting a freeze on architectural design! Logically it would seem that the Reformed churches of the present time should become ready clients for the architecture of restraint. Until recently, however, elaboration rather than simplification has ruled among many of these churches as the liturgical fad. Sometimes the desire for impressiveness has led to the building of a showcase for conspicuous worship. A group of historians working with L. J. Trinterud observes that the Roman- and Anglo-Catholic liturgical revivals most frequently produce the simplifiers of today; these men "often come out with Bucer and Calvin, and notably ahead of the contemporary heirs of Calvin." Their experiments put forth (as the Renaissance and Reformation did not) a new architectural setting and a restatement of Christian worship.

Through the past several years almost every Protestant church has been scurrying to build a chancel and push the communion table as far as possible from the worshipers. Meanwhile, in a rural parish in Burlington, Vermont, a Roman Catholic priest was telling architects, as they began to sketch designs for a new church, to forget that they had ever seen a church building of any kind before. He was also encouraging the laity to exercise their priesthood. "What we wanted to do was to pick up the mass and hurl it into the very midst of the congregation. . . . That is best achieved by pulling it out of its seclusion at the far end of a deep sanctuary at the far end of a long church, and dropping it down among the people who are offering it." Saying the mass face to face with the people and bringing them up close to the altar, this priest concludes, has made worship vivid and more meaningful to his parishioners.

Rather an amusing Protestant byplay on this story may be found in Columbus, Indiana, where thousands have made their pilgrimage to see one of the most distinguished contemporary church buildings in America. There is only one drawback. The wrong congregation got into the place—or maybe the right congregation got in for the wrong reason. At any rate, the building committee must have thought that they had hold of something new. According to a statement issued about the time of dedi-

cation, "The architect and building committee decided in the beginning that, as the Disciples of Christ have always discarded human opinions and traditions, they should ignore tradition in planning the new structure. . . ." With what result? Outside—a campanile, a cloister walk, and columns bearing a dogtooth pattern the Crusaders knew; inside—a narthex, ambulatory, nave, lectern and pulpit, and a raised, split chancel with organ, choirloft, and woven tapestry. How traditional can you get with contemporary forms?

The Disciples, who started out with the hope that all Christian people might feel free to gather around a common table, in this case did not give any clear architectural statement of their belief. The camp meeting has gone slightly high church! Moreover, the group that practices immersion included two baptistries in their plans, one at "the far end" of the church, out of sight except when in use, the other hidden behind a wood screen in a side chapel. At Columbus, Indiana, the only tradition the Disciples seem to have ignored is their own—and that is quite a trick, since they claim to follow no traditions whatever. The people who might well have employed an architectural romanticist turned, instead, to one who had obviously seen a church before.

Designed by the same architect, along lines very much like those of the Disciples' church in Columbus, the Christ Lutheran Church of Minneapolis, Minnesota, has been pointed out as the nearest thing we have to a prototype for a modern Protestant architecture. It blends the historic past with the present day. The right congregation gets into the building, and for the right reasons. Eliel Saarinen has placed the communion rail not in front of the lectern and pulpit, like a barricade, but behind them, where the kneeling communicant might almost reach out and touch the table itself. The pulpit looks massive and, in the right sense, authoritative; it is not central but neither is it a sidethought or a shadow-box. It stands in God's clear light. One sees a shadow on the wall behind the pulpit and above the communion vessels—the outline and shadow of the uplifted Cross.

Christ Church puts the choir in the rear balcony, a position that in good Lutheran fashion emphasizes the importance of congregational singing, the centrality of the sacraments, and the preaching of the "bare Word" of God. In recent Protestantism the choir processional has tended to become a "parade in costume and the forward surge of song," maneuvered by parallel columns that advance with a "hitch, teeter, and glide" to a four-four beat. This kind of robed choir was a nineteenth-century inno-

vation. Because of it the Protestant service has often shifted from common worship to public performance, with an appreciative audience and a genial master of ceremonies. Lutherans are among those who are pointing the way back to congregational worship.

It now remains for one of our leading Protestant churches to surprise us all by rediscovering the central pulpit. For years *The Christian Century* waged a losing battle against the Gothic uprising. The editors spilled buckets of hot lead into the linotypes, urging an architecture that would suggest a prophetic concern rather than a priestly code. As the Gothic tide withdraws, the Director of the Department of Worship and the Fine Arts for the National Council now expresses the quiet hope that the central pulpit might not be altogether lost to Protestantism. Marvin Halverson, the Director, reminds us that the eighteenth-century meetinghouse was likely to have had a pulpit at the front center, behind or near the communion table. This was true whether in Congregational churches of New England, Presbyterian churches of New Jersey, Lutheran churches of Pennsylvania, or Episcopalian churches of Virginia. In widely scattered areas, where Christian people accepted different orders of worship, the central pulpit stood for "the throne of the Word of God" and the sermon came to men as "the monstrance of the Word."

Will a classicist or a romanticist help some Protestant church to revive a symbol that once had meaning? Either could do the job, yet at the moment the romanticists are out in front. Near Madison, Wisconsin, Frank Lloyd Wright has already given one emphasis to the central position in a Unitarian church (which has more triangles in it than Athanasius could shake a stick at); and Eric Mendelsohn has given another striking emphasis in his B'nai Amoona Synagogue, St. Louis, Missouri.

Elsewhere in the secular auditorium the old sloping floor is coming back with split aisles and central podium, the old curved bench is coming back with airfoam seats, and everywhere, both in public meeting halls and churches, the old sliding partition is coming back with wrinkles in it. Architects have recently been employing more fluid forms, and thus have been putting into secular buildings many of the features Protestants have spent years in eliminating from their churches. Such fluid forms will doubtless modify the architectural setting for worship. "For Protestantism I like a round church, the people seeing one another," Paul Tillich declares. Maybe 1956 will start a trend in which a more nearly central pulpit comes back into its own once more.

Not that it matters theologically, historically, or otherwise, just where

the pulpit stands. Most of the Continental Reformers inherited *side* pulpits. Their voices were heard. Now as then, the force of Protestantism rises from its men and women, its biblical message, its contemporary ring. Luther stated that the Christian can pray as truly in a barn or pig sty as in a big church with a bell tower, and yet he fervently wished that all the arts might be brought to the obedience of Christ. In modern terms, that wish would include contemporary architecture.

Neither classicism nor romanticism will fully "satisfy the spirit" of those who seek after God. Satisfaction is a form of spiritual suicide. Yet the pulse of church life quickens with the desire to build a place of worship; and the people who encourage the best use of contemporary forms are likely to understand the immediate practical sense of the words from Revelation: "*I make all things new.*"

# Christian Hymnody As a Repository of Doctrine

NORMAN F. LANGFORD

ALL CHRISTIAN HYMNS are rooted in some sort of doctrine. Sometimes the doctrine is expressed by default, as when the non-descript character of a hymn reflects an author's indifference toward historic theology. In such cases, however, theological viewpoints other than orthodoxy are either implied or explicitly given a voice. Again there are hymns with little or no direct doctrinal content, which imply a disposition to take orthodoxy for granted. In no instance can it be said that a hymn has no theological rootage at all.

Enthusiasm for hymns, as for anything else, occasionally begets confusion of mind. This is surely the case when it is claimed that hymnody transcends doctrinal differences among Christians. To support this claim, it is correctly pointed out that Romanist and Protestant, Calvinist and Arminian, Quaker and Anglican, all contribute to the common heritage of Christian song. Those who hold varying creeds often succeed in suppressing peculiar features in their doctrine, while expressing the faith of the Church catholic, and thereby furnish one another with hymns that are acceptable to all.

This is not, however, to be equated with transcending theological questions. What such a phenomenon points to is a sort of hard core of doctrine, shared by enough Christians to give one at first glance an insecure impression of unanimity. At the same time, a closer inspection of hymnody also reveals sharp breaks and fundamental distinctions in theological outlook. The fact that most modern hymnals contain hymns of all kinds does not mean that all the hymns are equally representative of the views of the compilers. What minister is equally happy with all the hymns at his disposal, or prone to use all of them with equal conviction? What congregation, in so far as it notices what it is singing, is equally comfortable with all the hymns provided in the hymnbook of its denomination?

Since hymns exhibit to a striking degree variations, not only in literary

---

NORMAN F. LANGFORD, D.D., is Secretary of the Division of Curriculum Development and Editor in Chief in the General Division of Education in the Churches, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church U. S. A. A Canadian, he has studied and written in the field of hymnology.

and musical quality, but also in underlying assumptions of doctrine, it is noteworthy that the main substance of most Protestant hymnals is the same; and that this substance for the most part reflects the ancient and historic doctrines of the Church catholic. On the other hand, a significant part of these same hymnals is derived from a very different theological source; and, here again, the influence of this unorthodox type of hymnody has proved itself generally acceptable. This article will attempt to explore the facts and the implications involved in the statements just made.

## I

Within the limits of a magazine article it would be out of the question to analyze the specific contents of several particular hymnals. To take an approach only slightly less cumbersome, we shall first list the principal sources from which come the hymns most familiar to the English-speaking Protestant world. Then we shall try to see the manner in which Christian doctrine is treated in our widely accepted hymnody.

In a roughly spelled out list of sources, the most obvious is the paraphrase of Scriptural material. This, however, covers such a multitude of forms that it hardly lends itself to analysis as a separate item in this article. It ranges from the simple versification of Bible passages, chiefly the Psalms, to much more elaborate and interpretative compositions which are sometimes hardly recognizable as paraphrases at all. Indeed, so many hymns contain both direct and indirect Scriptural allusions that it is difficult to indicate where paraphrasing ceases.

A source of first-class importance is to be found in the ancient Greek hymns; and, more prominently, in the Latin hymns of the ancient and medieval Church. These began to come into familiar use, among English-speaking congregations, through the brilliant translations of John Mason Neale, Edward Caswall, and others in the nineteenth century.

Not many English hymns, other than paraphrases, were written before the eighteenth century; although Bishop Ken, in the seventeenth century, was an important forerunner of later authors. Isaac Watts (1674-1748) and Philip Doddridge (1702-1751)—both nonconformists—opened up the field of English hymnody. Then the enormous contribution of the Methodist revival, especially through the work of Charles Wesley, consolidated the position of the English hymn. In the eighteenth century, too, the Church of England was strongly represented by the evangelical poets, William Cowper and John Newton, whose collected *Olney Hymns* appeared in 1779. A few other eighteenth-century writers composed

hymns that have endured in common use, but this period pretty well divides itself into the three great schools of Watts, Wesley, and the Olney writers.

In the nineteenth century there arose a long succession of Anglican hymn writers, too numerous to be referred to in detail, who swelled the volume of English hymnody. Representative names, familiar in connection with various well-known hymns, are Reginald Heber, John Keble, Henry Francis Lyte, Sir Henry Williams Baker, William Walsham How, John Ellerton, Cecil Frances Alexander, Charlotte Elliott, and Frances Ridley Havergal. The nineteenth century also produced the abundance of translation already referred to, and including in addition many important translations from German hymnody.

While the Church of England seems to hold the honors in the nineteenth century, there were also writers who made permanent contributions from the non-Anglican side: James Montgomery and Thomas Kelly (who both straddle the two centuries) and Horatius Bonar are outstanding names. Among Roman Catholics, there was activity too; the hymns of John Henry Newman, and of Frederick William Faber, as well as Caswall's translations, have been received into Protestant usage. Matthew Bridges and Adelaide Anne Proctor were also Roman Catholics, who are represented in most present-day collections.

The nineteenth and early twentieth century also opened up a new type of hymnody—the gospel hymn, accompanying the big revivals, and produced in quantity by American writers. Such variation exists in the quality of gospel hymns that classification is thereby made exceedingly difficult. It is certainly unfair to lump them all together, especially when one considers that on the whole this new development is regarded by serious hymnologists as a debasement of hymnody. Yet the general type is readily identified by anyone in the least familiar with hymnology.

The American contribution in the nineteenth century is by no means confined to so-called gospel hymns. Ray Palmer, George Washington Doane, and Phillips Brooks were obviously writers of a very different kind. Washington Gladden and Frank Mason North, both of whom lived on into the twentieth century, speak with distinctive voices. Twentieth-century hymnody as such is too recent to describe or classify with accuracy.

Meanwhile the nineteenth century had brought about a hymnological development of very great moment. This was the emergence of Unitarian hymnody, of which more will be said at a later point in the article. Not only did Unitarianism produce its own hymnbooks, with alterations of

orthodox hymnody as well as original compositions, but it also introduced into the orthodox churches a large number of its characteristic hymns. The number of Unitarian writers represented in the majority of Protestant hymnbooks is striking: Sir John Bowring, Stopford A. Brooke, Sarah Flower Adams, among English writers; and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Samuel Johnson, Samuel Longfellow, Edmund Hamilton Sears, and Frederick Lucian Hosmer, from the American side. If Whittier, who, though technically a Quaker, has been claimed for the Unitarian fold, be added, we have a formidable array of writers whose contributions are now standard in Protestant hymnals. Moreover, beyond the direct use of Unitarian hymnody, there is the further question of how far modern Protestant hymn writing has been affected by Unitarian influence.

## II

Such, then, are the principal sources from which are derived the contents of the modern Protestant hymnal. The next matter to consider is how historic Christian doctrine fares when expressed in some of these sources.

What, we must ask, are the main concerns of historic doctrine, as reflected in all Church theology? They center around the Person and work of Jesus Christ; and this centrality of Christ involves us in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. It involves us just as immediately in the doctrine of atonement; in the forgiveness, justification, and sanctification of the believer who through faith holds to Christ. It involves us in the doctrine of the Church, which is the Body of Christ. It involves us in the question of eternal life, here and hereafter. This study will seek to show, in rough outline, how these basic doctrines are mirrored and expressed in various phases of hymnody.<sup>1</sup>

In much of the hymnody commonly published and sung, all these themes, and others with them, are so interwoven as to be inseparable. In this respect hymnody follows the structure of classical theology, in which the Person of Christ (as God incarnate) is closely bound up with the work of Christ (as our present and eternal Redeemer). Perhaps the most convenient point at which to begin, and surely the most basic, is the doctrine of the Trinity: which, however, will quickly be seen as expressing more than an isolated metaphysical idea.

<sup>1</sup> Dogmatics would be fully as concerned with the doctrine of Bible, as the appointed witness of God to himself in Christ. However, while hymnody occasionally sings of the Scriptures, it is not to be expected that hymns, as an expression of common worship, would often devote themselves directly to praising the Bible. For the preaching of the Word is constitutive of common worship; and it is the task of hymnody to make answer, as it were, to what it hears in the Bible. The Scriptures in worship thus are the presupposition of hymns, rather than a special subject of doctrine to be treated by the hymn writer.

Taking the ancient and medieval hymns first, we may say that even the most casual survey of them discloses a predilection for doxologies to the Trinity. Again and again the Latin writers reach their conclusion in lines which praise or invoke the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Low before Him with our praises we fall,  
Of whom, and in whom, and through whom are all;  
Of whom, the Father; and through whom, the Son;  
In whom, the Spirit, with these ever one.

This fine sample from Abelard's "O what their joy and their glory must be" exhibits medieval resourcefulness in making the doxology creative and not merely conventional. The practice of using such doxologies has great antiquity, and the one most widely used even to the present day comes from ancient times:

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;  
As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

This, in the first line, represents an early expression of faith in the Holy Trinity. The second line, probably added later, reflects the Church's assertion of Nicene doctrine over against Arianism.

Not merely the doxology itself, however, but the whole hymn was likely in ancient and medieval times to embody Trinitarian doctrine. It is characteristic to approach God as the Creator God revealed by his Son Jesus Christ; to approach Jesus Christ as the creative Word who reveals the Father; to approach the Holy Ghost as the creator Spirit through whose office the Father and Son are revealed. None of the divine Persons is abstracted from his position in the Godhead. Moreover, this approach disciplines the praises and the prayers that the devout offer to God. It disciplines the very thought of how daily life is to be ordered under God's Word and will. In the following verses from a hymn ascribed to Ambrose of Milan, note the interweaving of concepts arising from the doctrine of the Trinity; the fluent movement of thoughts about the human day and the eternal day and the eternal Dayspring.

O Splendor of God's glory bright,  
From light eternal bringing light,  
Thou Light of light, light's living Spring,  
True Day, all days illumining:

Come, very Sun of heaven's love,  
In lasting radiance from above,  
And pour the Holy Spirit's ray  
On all we think or do today.

Confirm our will to do the right,  
And keep our hearts from envy's blight;  
Let faith her eager fires renew  
And hate the false, and love the true.

Dawn's glory gilds the earth and skies,  
Let Him, our perfect Morn, arise,  
The Word in God the Father One,  
The Father imaged in the Son.<sup>2</sup>

Medieval hymnody abounds with such examples—few of them, alas, now in common use. Passing on to native English hymnody, it is hardly necessary to mention the familiar Doxology of Bishop Ken, sung in thousands of churches every Sunday. Watts, the pioneer of English hymn development, is seldom striking in his explicit Trinitarianism—though in “When I survey the wondrous cross,” we have the bold and almost unexpected “Christ my God.” With Charles Wesley, however, we are confronted by an embarrassment of riches. It is not a matter of a formula or a doxology. Again and again his hymns express the most vigorous Trinitarian thought, informed by a thorough understanding of the Incarnation—one need go no further than “Hark! the herald angels sing”—and of the office of the Holy Spirit, as indicated in hymns like “Spirit of faith, come down,” and “Come, Holy Ghost, our hearts inspire.” Few of Wesley’s successors give so strong an impression of knowing what they were doing in respect to Trinitarian doctrine. Yet in the productive period that immediately followed there is little sign of deviation from classical theology, on the part of either Anglican or nonconformist writers. Where themes other than the Trinity as such are in view, there remains the sense of Trinitarian discipline. For instance, the ascriptions to Christ in Newton’s “How sweet the name of Jesus sounds” are clearly written by one who has been confronted by the Father in the Son.

The mention of Newton’s hymn brings us to a consideration of the work of Christ, in our atonement, justification and sanctification. There are countless hymns in common use, which address themselves to this theme: to name but a few, “When I survey the wondrous cross,” “Rock of Ages,” “O for a thousand tongues to sing,” “Love divine, all loves excelling” (this one within a carefully conceived Trinitarian framework), “Just as I am,” “None other Lamb.” These are representative of a wide range of hymn writing extending from Watts to the late nineteenth century. Needless to say, the so-called gospel hymns seek to be strong at this point, and must in

<sup>2</sup> Translation by Louis F. Benson; *The Presbyterian Hymnal*, No. 32.

many cases be given credit for their intention despite the doubtful quality of the product.

But now that we are considering the work of Christ, the interweaving of themes becomes, if possible, still more intricate. Sin, forgiveness, the Church, new life in Christ, the life of the world to come, the second Advent of Christ—all these are mingled in the very same hymns. That which Christ has done, and that which he will do, involve every facet of basic Christian belief. To separate the fundamental Christian doctrines is as impossible for the hymn writer as for the theologian.

Medieval hymnody has a distinctive approach to these interwoven themes. It begins, so to speak, with the end: that is, with the thought of the eternal life toward which the Christian as a pilgrim is moving. This, however, is not isolated merely as a hope of heaven after death. It involves the whole existential situation of the Christian in the Church—living in time, yet with eternity always impinging upon him. In this context, medieval hymnody is free to become highly evangelical. Consider, for example, "Jesus, the very thought of Thee," and "Jesus, Thou Joy of loving hearts."

Few medieval hymns are so well known as "Jerusalem, the golden." It is perhaps unfortunate that the lengthy poem from which this hymn is drawn is chiefly represented in our hymnals by "Jerusalem, the golden"; for, taken by themselves, these lines might seem to isolate the thought of heaven as simply the dream of something beyond the grave. Other and better selections from this poem (the *Hora Novissima*) were formerly more familiar than they appear to be now: "Brief life is here our portion," "For thee, O dear, dear country," and "The world is very evil." It is instructive as well as moving to read a consecutive passage from the *Hora Novissima* which looks not only to the world to come, but equally to the present issue of sin and salvation:

Jerusalem, exulting  
On that securst shore,  
I hope thee, wish thee, sing thee,  
And love thee evermore!  
I ask not for my merit:  
I seek not to deny  
My merit is destruction,  
A child of wrath am I:  
But yet with faith I venture  
And hope upon my way;  
For those perennial guerdons  
I labor night and day.

The Best and Dearest Father  
 Who made me and who saved,  
 Bore with me in defilement,  
 And from defilement laved;  
 When in His strength I struggle,  
 For very joy I leap;  
 When in my sin I totter,  
 I weep, or try to weep:  
 And grace, sweet grace celestial,  
 Shall all its love display,  
 And David's Royal Fountain  
 Purge every sin away.<sup>3</sup>

Leaping over to English hymnody, one must say that Watts' hymns, though very devout, seldom develop ideas very profoundly or subtly. Far different is the case with Charles Wesley. His feeling for eschatology displays itself in expressing the joyful way in which the Church and its people move on toward the victorious end. In one bold stroke, he gathers the mysteries of time and eternity into the concept of the Church militant becoming the Church triumphant:

One family we dwell in Him,  
 One Church above, beneath,  
 Though now divided by the stream,  
 The narrow stream of death;  
  
 One army of the living God,  
 To His command we bow:  
 Part of His host have crossed the flood,  
 And part are crossing now.<sup>4</sup>

The movement from earth to heaven appears also under the category of sanctification, which again is conceived by Wesley in an eschatological way without detracting from the sense of immediacy.

Finish, then, Thy new creation;  
 Pure and spotless let us be;  
 Let us see Thy great salvation,  
 Perfectly restored in Thee,  
 Changed from glory into glory,  
 Till in heaven we take our place,  
 Till we cast our crowns before Thee,  
 Lost in wonder, love, and praise.<sup>5</sup>

Perhaps the most closely woven of all familiar Wesley hymns, the advent hymn "Come, Thou long-expected Jesus," pursues with inevita-

<sup>3</sup> *Collected Hymns, Sequences and Carols of John Mason Neale*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1914, pp. 212f.

<sup>4</sup> "Come, let us join our friends above."

<sup>5</sup> "Love Divine, all loves excelling."

bility all the great themes of Christian faith and life: the Christ who has come, the deliverance we yet look for, the Kingdom of Christ in which he reigns by the Holy Spirit, the sufficiency of Jesus' atoning merit, the immediate hope and the ultimate hope expressed in double meanings:

Come, Thou long-expected Jesus,  
Born to set Thy people free;  
From our fears and sins release us;  
Let us find our rest in Thee.  
Israel's Strength and Consolation,  
Hope of all the earth Thou art;  
Dear Desire of every nation,  
Joy of every longing heart.

Born Thy people to deliver  
Born a child and yet a King,  
Born to reign in us forever,  
Now Thy gracious kingdom bring.  
By Thine own eternal Spirit  
Rule in all our hearts alone;  
By thine all-sufficient merit  
Raise us to Thy glorious throne.

Of all English hymn writers none was so deft as Wesley in achieving the organic unity of great ideas. Yet his successors in the great tradition also knew how to speak of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, grace, hope, love, and the last things in the same breath. This faculty is strikingly exhibited in hymns that can almost be picked at random: for example, Newton's "Glorious things of thee are spoken," Kelly's "The Head that once was crowned with thorns," Montgomery's "O Spirit of the living God," Ellerton's "O Son of God, our Captain of salvation," or Stone's "The Church's one foundation." Even so simple a hymn as Keble's "Sun of my soul, Thou Saviour dear" traverses a great deal of ground; and it is both rooted in the knowledge of grace and quietly eager for the final consummation. Such hymns, with countless others that enrich our hymnals, are firmly grounded in essential doctrine, and enable the congregation to express its faith and its prayer in language that has been moulded by ecumenical and evangelical theology.

### III

In this broad characterization of our traditional hymnody, stress has been laid upon the interweaving of the chief themes of Christian doctrine. The great bulk of our accepted hymnody lies within this tradition. It exists within a clear though elaborate theological discipline: Trinitarian,

eschatological, preoccupied with the knowledge, hope, and expectation of salvation. The continued use of hymns in this tradition would seem to indicate that such hymns express the matters which are central in common worship.

Yet the testimony of our standard hymnody is not unambiguous. For there also exists a smaller but also very popular body of hymnody which has drawn its inspiration elsewhere than from classical theology. It is the hymnody that has either come directly from Unitarian sources or has allowed itself to be influenced by the Unitarian examples.

The clue to the Unitarian understanding of hymnology is suggested by some words from John Julian's *A Dictionary of Hymnology*. Julian tells us that Martineau, in compiling his first collection of Unitarian hymns in 1840, developed "the thought of worship as being the natural expression of emotion, awakened in the mind 'possessed with the religious or mysterious conception of God, of life and death, of duty, of futurity,' and shows how the substances of the devotion of the various writers, whose hymns are adopted, is preserved, while the special dialect of their dogmatic theology is changed into a more universal language."<sup>6</sup>

This idea of a general religiousness, free from the shackles of any particular dogmatism, dissolved the discipline that controls the great majority of English-language hymns. Specifically, it dissolved the discipline of Trinitarian thought, as might have been anticipated and as was, of course, desired by the Unitarians. Thus the Father becomes isolated from the Son, and we have the non-Christological references to God which are so characteristic of, for example, Hosmer's hymns. Yet Hosmer is usually represented in Protestant hymnals. It is remarkable to see his well-known hymn, "Thy Kingdom come," in which the stars are represented as strong for the right but nothing is said about Jesus Christ, in one modern hymnal placed side by side with "O come, O come, Emmanuel." It is equally remarkable to find Samuel Johnson's "City of God, how broad and far," which conceives of the Church as little more than a growing empire "of freedom, love and truth," in the same hymnal with "The Church's one foundation is Jesus Christ her Lord. . . ."

If God and his Church are conceived without benefit of Christology, it is also the case that Jesus is conceived without belief in our Lord's oneness with his Father. Thus Jesus becomes, under the influence of extreme liberal doctrine, "our Hero strong and tender . . . Lover of children,

<sup>6</sup> Julian, J., *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, 1908 edition, article, "Unitarian Hymnody."

boyhood's inspiration." As for the Holy Spirit, even the orthodox Anglican Church gave rise, through two of its nineteenth-century writers, to hymns to the Holy Spirit which are in fact nothing but weak expressions of mysticism: "Breathe on me, breath of God," and "Spirit of God, descend upon my heart." The Spirit becomes understood in connection with the state of the human mind and heart, not in connection with the Word whom it is his office to reveal. Such are the results of dissolving the Trinity, whether within or outside the bounds of formal Unitarianism. Hymns under this influence have become so commonplace that one of the most popular of Christian carols, "It came upon the midnight clear," turns out to have been written by a Unitarian and to contain no reference to Jesus the Son of God. The angels of hallowed tradition are invoked, not to proclaim anew the coming of God incarnate, but in order that we may revive our hopes in the coming "age of gold."

It would be idle, not to say bigoted, to cavil about any good hymn on the ground that a Unitarian wrote it. Christians may surely be free to sing "Nearer, my God, to Thee," regardless of the Unitarian origin of the hymn. On the whole, however, it is disturbing to find the orthodox churches so uncritical that they feel no discomfort in using a body of hymnody that departs radically from our doctrinal foundations. Sentiment tends to inhibit unfavorable comment on popular hymns. But this is a sentimentalism we can ill afford. From the first, hymns were used for propaganda—both by Arius and his opponents! Hymns are powerful to implant and reinforce ideas. The larger proportion of our hymnody is committed to classical doctrine, and is brilliantly executed. Perhaps some day a denomination will take seriously the challenge to its own doctrine presented by hymns it blandly mixes in with the historic hymnody of Protestantism.

# What Is a Church-Related College?

WINSTON L. KING

## I

ONCE UPON A TIME there was no doubt in anyone's mind on the relation of the church to the college in the United States. It was a simple and direct relationship: the college was an instrument for the propagation of the faith. It was founded primarily to provide preachers and teachers for the Christian churches. Thus in 1754 President Clap of Yale declared that "Colleges are *Societies of Ministers*, for training up persons for the Work of the *Ministry*"; and in the same year a public notice by King's College (later Columbia University) stated:

"The chief thing that is aimed at in this College, is to teach and engage the Children to know God in Jesus Christ, and to love and serve him in all *Sobriety, Godliness, and Richness of Life*, with a perfect heart and willing mind; and to train them up in all Virtuous Habits, and all such useful knowledge as may render them creditable to their Families and Friends, Ornaments to their Country, and useful to the public Weal in their generation."<sup>1</sup>

Much the same could have been said of all twenty-four of the colleges established by 1800 and of the vast majority of the 246 that had been established by 1860. Only seventeen of them were state colleges, the rest being, almost without exception, church schools.

Those days are gone forever. By 1950 some two million students were attending tax-supported institutions—that is, state institutions which are by definition non- or unreligious. Most of the oldest once-religious colleges have become privately endowed independent institutions. In the full sense of "church college," there are perhaps only a few churches which still maintain them. Even so, some 708 out of a total of 1,808 institutions of higher education are still in some sense church-related. There are, for example, the *parochial* colleges of Roman Catholic and Lutheran connection. Characteristic of the latter are the following statements by an official of a Lutheran college:

---

<sup>1</sup> Cubberley, Ellwood P., *The History of Education*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920, p. 703.

---

WINSTON L. KING, B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D., is Dean of the Chapel and Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa. He finds the term "church-related" "a very elastic hamper, full of diverse items," and holds that there is need for more precision and honesty.

The college is under the direct responsibility and control of the church. Our Lutheran colleges are church colleges rather than church-related. All members of the Board of Trustees . . . are members of the church and must be according to the Constitution.

Faculty members, prior to their engagement, are to be "informed of the ideals and spirit of the College" and "to join these faculties on condition of agreement with the object of the College." That object is to provide a higher education under "the direction of a faculty motivated by the Christian faith" and to "teach youth the way of life determined by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Chapel attendance is compulsory; twelve semester hours of work in Christianity are required for graduation. The church contributes about one ninth of the college budget annually.

A variant of this is the *orthodox evangelical* and Bible college, which has been dissatisfied both with the state university and with many of the church colleges. This tends to be specifically sectarian, to teach conservative Biblicalism, and to strongly emphasize the religiously evangelistic quality of life. Numbers of such are still being founded, and are often controlled by amorphous religious associations or small sects.

## II

But it is those institutions somewhere in the midlands between the "godless" state and sometimes private universities on the left, and the parochial and evangelical colleges on the right, that chiefly concern us here. They comprise the vast bulk of our smaller colleges. They are not tax-supported; nor are they church colleges in the strict sense. So we have called them *church-related*. And what does this term mean? Almost anything you wish. In some cases it is merely a genealogical footnote. "We have descended from a certain religious group"—with emphasis on "descended from," especially the "from." Sometimes this phrase contains all the warmth of thirty-second degree cousinship, in which one sends Christmas cards and to which kinship he refers on grandiose occasions. Elsewhere it has the flavor of an estranged partnership, one party to which pays a bit of alimony for some lip-service from the other. Increasingly it seems also to be a case of a long-absent but newly poor relative now busily refurbishing the old church tie.

But to be more specific, let us note some of the actual statements of relationship to be found here. There follow some random statements from the catalogues of "church-related" colleges:

College A "by heritage and purpose is a Christian College with the objective of providing education and developing personality around a core of Christian principles and ideals. Life on the campus is influenced by the close relationship of the college to the \_\_\_\_\_ church."

College B . . . "seeks to promote the curriculum and activities of a Christian Liberal Arts College," number twelve of whose Liberal Christian Purposes is "the attainment of a truer perspective upon man and his place in the universe, which will reveal a divine destiny and invite his loyalty to a Christian moral purpose."

College C is "definitely Christian in heritage and present purpose but nonsectarian in its outlook and teaching," and has as its fundamental purpose to "inspire and train young men and women for effective Christian citizenship in a democracy."

College D has been "an avowedly Christian college" throughout the hundred years of its history. Though without creed or denominational control, "it has always been deeply concerned with the quest for truth and resolute to aid in bringing about such application of truth as well as to increase the fullness of life in the individual and society."

College E "is definitely Christian but nondenominational, welcoming students of every faith."

College F is "a college of liberal arts dedicated to the advancement of humane learning." The college defines a liberally educated person as one who (among a half-dozen other things) . . . "is thoroughly grounded in the history of the modern world and in Christian origins." It goes on to state that its religious program is "designed to meet the needs and interests of all students in an undenominational way," and to offer "opportunity for expression of Christian ideals in service."

### III

Thus the church-related colleges express themselves about their "related" churches. How do the churches express themselves about their related colleges? An official Presbyterian pronouncement phrases its definition of a church-related college thus, though it tends to use the phrase "church college" more often:

If a college wishes to maintain an officially recognized affiliation to the Presbyterian Church, its first step is loyalty to the Church's purpose. That means more than a statement in the catalogue. It means more than giving courses in the Bible. It means building an organization and conducting a program that aim frankly to do, within the framework of modern higher education, what the Church is aiming to do . . . to

win men and women to Christ and to insure their constant growth in Christian belief, Christian character, and Christian service. A college that is either negative or neutral in this matter has little direct claim on the Church. . . . Piety is no substitute for academic excellence; but good scholarship is no excuse for impiety.<sup>2</sup>

The board of Home Missions of the Congregational-Christian Churches in 1945 adopted a statement of "The Criteria of the Church College" which declares its colleges to be autonomous, but requires for denominational listing as church-related that they give convincing guarantees of "forthright and wholehearted cooperation with and participation in the whole life of the Congregational-Christian fellowship." (Some two dozen or so are listed.) And some of the criteria of such co-operation are:

1. Its plan of education is functionally integrated in the larger Christian community.
2. It seeks to make the total experience of the students a Christian one.
3. Its staff personnel, whether in the trustees, administration, or faculty, shall be composed mainly of men and women who actively foster the Christian faith.
4. Its emphasis in the teaching function is on the Christian viewpoint.

Our other example is drawn from the strongly connectional and educationally conscious Methodist Church. According to its *Discipline* the Board of Education shall "definitely relate the educational institutions of the church to the church" and

create and maintain an atmosphere in the institutions conducive to the development of a Christian philosophy of life to the end that all members of the college and university communities may possess a knowledge and understanding of the Christian faith, and that students may emerge from their educational experiences prepared to witness to the gospel in every area of life.

Another paragraph states that denominational funds shall be made available "only to those approved institutions whose educational and religious aims and programs . . . are in active accord with the Discipline."

In a brochure, *Trustees* (April, 1953) some nine marks of a Christian college are listed, among which are the following:

- "2. . . . A church college should be Christian without apology.
- "5. A sound curricular program must confront every student with the 'Big Questions.' 'What is man? What is the universe? What is God? What of the Christian claim that Jesus has revealed the full nature of God?'
- "7. . . . Student selection is of foremost importance. Education in a Christian college is indicated for any student who is capable of challenge.

<sup>2</sup> Lloyd, Ralph W., *Our Presbyterian Colleges*, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, USA.

"9. Finally, the Christian college must support the work of the church in every way it can. Concern for church vocation is one of these, and the Church has every right to expect that from its educational institutions shall come most of its missionaries, its ministers, and its workers."

#### IV

Having heard what the church-related college and the college-related church have to say to each other, we go on to ask: How church-related *are* the church-related colleges in actuality?

A further observation with regard to the Methodist statement just quoted gives us something of a tip-off as to actualities. Despite the general grant of authority given the Board of Education of The Methodist Church by the *Discipline*, it is noteworthy that the language of the above brochure, which represents the actual working atmosphere of the relation, is gently persuasive rather than mandatory. Further, from some of the Board's current figures, it is observable that in the list of ninety-four college-grade "Methodist" institutions, are included several large universities whose religious character is perhaps no more noticeable than that of any other independent university. Still further, the church is currently contributing only .6 per cent of current operational budgets to its universities, and about 6 per cent to its senior colleges. These facts indicate that the aforesaid "marks" of the church college are no doubt ideal goals rather than operating practices or soon-to-be-implemented standards.

No specially discriminatory finger is being pointed at the Methodists by such statements, for the same can be said of most other church-related colleges. Should we ask, for instance, about student enrollment, we must say that most of them by no means discourage students of other than their own faith from enrolling—despite some denominational pressures. One liberal-minded college declares: "No student shall be refused admission to, or denied any of the privileges, honors, or degrees of said College, on account of the religious opinions he may entertain." While such a forthright declaration of complete tolerance is seldom made in college catalogues, it can be confidently opined that it is very near the actual practice in most cases. Thus one church-related college of the author's acquaintance has only 20 per cent of its own denominational children enrolled (many of whom are not aware that it is *their* church college), equal numbers from each of two other churches, and the remaining 40 per cent from a wide variety of still others. In fact many such colleges pride themselves on the religious diversity of

their students. And even in some church colleges, say the Lutheran, there are substantial enrollments of outsiders, running from 35 per cent to 45 per cent.

Now, what of the *teaching* that goes on in church-related colleges? One may safely generalize here that it is quite obvious that few if any of them today teach denominational tenets in any very strenuous way. There may be something of a denominational atmosphere provided by the church affiliations and activities of the faculty, by official ecclesiastical relationships, and the kind and variety of campus religious speakers chosen; but on the whole most institutions are anxious to proclaim that their religious teachings are only conceived in the most generally Christian terms.

With regard to course offerings the pattern varies considerably. Some few church-related colleges have no religious course of any sort required. In others one reaches into the religion department's grab-bag, and, with eyes closed, picks any three-hour course he desires—Biblical Literature, Teachings of Jesus, Great Religious Leaders, Religion in Western Culture, History of Religions, Philosophy of Life, or Holy What-Not. Still others require one or two basic courses with supposedly Christian content.

What, then, of the religious attitudes and affiliations of church-related college *faculty*? Is a definite creedal affirmation or religious commitment required? The answer may be either "No, but . . ." or "Yes, but . . .," depending. One church-originated college flatly says: "No instructors in said College shall ever be required by the Trustees to profess any particular religious opinion as a test of office." And practically, one must confess, most church-related colleges do not do too much better, no matter what their professions about hiring instructors. First and foremost is a man's teaching competence; second and second-most his record of publication; thirdly his personality traits; fourthly, how much salary he will come for; and fifth-most, and often forgotten in the rush, are his religious specifications.

To be sure, there are limits. Should a prospective instructor pointedly say that he neither has, nor sees the need of, any religious belief or church relation, he would not be hired in a church-related college if there were any way out—unless an extremely broad-minded president would think that his exceedingly pious faculty needed the spur of an unbeliever in their midst. More often than not, the question is tacitly passed by in faculty hiring, or else rationalized. Someone of another than Christian, or of no faith, is characterized as showing a "fine Christian spirit"; or a feeble pass in this direction may be made, with dubious results. Said the president of

a college that emphasizes its church relatedness, to a group of which the writer was a member: "We at X College always inquire whether or not a professor is an active church man before we hire him. Now take Professor Y, whom you know," (turning to me) "he was actively religious when you knew him, wasn't he?" My suggestion that he was somewhat less than apostolic in manifesting any outward religious zeal, was hastily brushed over with the comment—which I was given no opportunity to affirm or deny—"Well, certainly he has a high religious potential." (And so has *every* son of Adam, no doubt.) From there we jumped rapidly into another subject.

With regard to the religious affiliations of the board of trustees, the less said the better. Administrations even of church-related colleges apparently believe that a trustee with willing money is a gift of Divine grace, not to be rejected for the mere lack of a religious zeal or home-church label.

And what of required *religious exercises*? A random sampling suggests an equally random pattern. Some require nothing of any sort. On the other hand, some require all of every sort—daily chapel, Sunday vespers, or church attendance, and convocations. And "in between on the misty flats the rest drift to and fro" between varied forms of partial requirements. Indeed there seems to remain something of a haloed sanctity about required chapel, even in institutions that are only very dimly religious in any light. Though totally without other requirements in this area, the getting together for any purpose whatever—announcements, programs of supposed "general" interest, occasional religious addresses—is thought to be a holy good from a holier past, not to be lightly set aside.

Finally, the *financial and administrative* relationships of colleges to their ecclesiastical in-laws are widely varied. Some explicitly acknowledge a subordinate relationship. One Presbyterian college declares itself to be controlled by directors chosen by a certain synod. What this means by way of actual supervision (annual campus visitation?) or financial support is not evident. Most of its courses in religion have a definite Christian orientation, however.

Another college writes that in its administration and program, "unfailing support has been given by the Board of Education and the University Senate of the \_\_\_\_\_ church." Again it is impossible to judge what this means. Apparently the control is not too strict, since it is both "Christian in purpose" and "welcomes students of all denominations."

Another large group of colleges rather glory in their independence. One such institution acknowledges its founding by, and indebtedness to, a particular denomination, but goes on to say: "Today . . . \_\_\_\_\_ College is not controlled by any religious denomination, but is completely independent." (Over which fact there has been considerable wailing and weeping in the aforesaid denomination.)

## V

And now in conclusion, we shall try to pull these random observations together into some sort of unity. Obviously the term "church-related" is a very elastic hamper, full of a large variety of diverse items. Or to state it otherwise: the term apparently covers all those institutions which have some sort of church connection in their past or present and have not actually repudiated it.

Comforting as vague generalities sometimes are, there are signs that not all colleges and all churches are happy about *this* vagueness. The churches on their side have become aware of their great stake in the quality and nature of higher education. College is that critical period in the life of the young person when he decides whether to reinterpret and implement his home and community religious training, or to slough it off. Results even in the church-related colleges have not been altogether happy; even here students may "lose their faith." Nor are the ranks of the servants of the Church and of God full to overflowing these days. Can something be done to renew the religious vitality of the church-related college?

So also there are evidences that church-related colleges are responding to churchly interest in their future. And what are their motives? Sometimes they parallel those of the church leaders: a genuine concern for the achievement of a Christianly oriented and motivated educational program. A significant number of the administrators of such colleges are convinced that their type of institution has plus values which ought to be more fully exploited, and have vigorously so expressed themselves.

But some of this new-born interest is of the economic variety. Many colleges which rather blithely cut all their ecclesiastical ties a generation or two ago, in the interests of academic independence and/or of acquiring some nonsectarian financial support or other, are now finding their freedom a still glorious but financially meager diet in the face of rising costs. So they are unobtrusively, but they hope effectively, mending their church ties and renewing lapsed traditions.

## VI

What will be the upshot of this new mutual interest? It may well be a sourly unhappy situation unless each party to it is willing honestly to think and act out its real intentions. On the churches' side such questions as these must be raised:

1. Do they realize how critical is the financial plight of many a church-related institution? They should, since it is the plight of most privately endowed education, only more so. It is more so because church colleges have been trying very hard in recent years to raise their standards and also because big industry and corporation foundations—should they become generous to education—are likely to bypass the denominational college. (Besides, do the church-related colleges want to be too dependent on industry?)

2. Churches should realize the strong fear of denominational control which lurks in many an academic breast. Shades of ancient heresy trials, dishonest creedal commitments, and restrictive academic pressures still haunt teachers' minds. Many a teacher in the church-related college is thoroughly committed to the small-college values and to a generally Christian program of education, but would valiantly resist strong denominational pressures.

3. The churches need to consider very closely what it is that they expect of their related colleges. To be sure, as we have seen, a number of churches have made definite pronouncements in this area. Those that have not, need to; and those that have, need further to consider carefully what they have said and how they will proceed to implement it without generating strong fears of coercion. The actual administration of such policies is a key matter here.

But equally, church-related colleges now eager to re-relate themselves need to be deliberately honest.

1. Every administration which is refurbishing church ties needs to ask whether it has the full backing of its faculty and trustees. Are these latter truly in favor of it, genuinely desirous of strengthening the religious quality of the college's life and relating it more adequately to the church? Or is it only a frantic administration grasping at whatever financial straw offers itself? (And most church-related support is little more than a straw, a few odd thousands on the average.) Or, perchance, is it part of a public relations dream of making X college all things to all men, if thereby some students and some dollars might be gained for Alma Mater—a well-rounded country-club, a glorious haven of academic freedom, a large-scale

producer of men of distinction, and a devoutly Christian community of saints? In short, what sort of institution does X college (its trustees, faculty, administration) really want to be, public relations statements aside?

2. Still further: What is the price which the college is willing to pay for church aid and support? How much and of what sort are some extra thousands in the college budget worth? Does the college owe and desire to pay more than lip service to its denominational heritage? If it receives church support and a denominational listing, does it not owe something of concrete result by way of a genuine effort to produce future church leaders, and a vital institutional religious program? In other words, it seems unethical for a college to accept a church name, certainly church support, without that connection meaning something by way of character and commitment. If not, it would be better honestly to disclaim the connection altogether.

## VII

Probably the question of future relations boils down to whether Church and church-related colleges can find a valid *modus operandi* which shall conserve what each considers essential. In such a pattern narrow denominational Christianity is probably out. Churches must be willing to support definitely Christian colleges without requiring close sectarian conformity. So also are close, rigid controls out of order; controls must be general rather than tightly specific. Nor must piety, or quantity production of church workers, be made substitutes for good academic education.

On the other hand, the colleges that wish to remain related to the church must assume more religious responsibility than some of them have in the past. A very minimum would be the requirement of some curricular courses in religion. Further it would mean the genuine promotion of a vital and adequate religious life on campus, and the cherishing of denominational ties. Admittedly some of these values are easier to state than to implement, but a church-related college can scarcely try to do less. Perhaps the key is in *personnel*, however. This, in the author's view, is more central than the specific program. Programs and curriculums can be produced, but it is the personal factor, the influence of administrative and faculty personnel, that is crucial. Only as genuinely Christian people form the hard core of institutional staffs will the phrase "church-related" be worth the paper it is written on. The only truly church-related college is one in which the living, thinking, and teaching of its staff are devotedly Christian and directly relate it to the local and the larger religious fellowship.

# Bibliographical Materials on the Episcopal Church

NIELS H. SONNE

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH in the United States of America lacks a detailed and exhaustive bibliography of its literature, and no plans for the production of such a work are known to this writer. The Church, however, is well provided with bibliographies of a general and popular nature, planned for the use of laymen or beginning students. The Church's Department of Christian Education is sponsoring a six-volume series entitled *The Church's Teaching*, the purpose of which is to present the Episcopal Church and its position in a popular manner. Four of the volumes are of special value to those who wish to understand the Church and its history. They are: P. M. Dawley, *Chapters in Church History*; J. A. Pike and W. N. Pittenger, *The Faith of the Church*; M. H. Shepherd, Jr., *The Worship of the Church*; and P. M. Dawley, *The Episcopal Church and Its Work*. All are published by the Seabury Press in Greenwich, Connecticut, and are now in print. Appended to each of these books are competently annotated bibliographies of works selected for their usefulness to the clergy, church-school teachers, and interested laymen. The texts of the books in this series, supplemented with readings in the suggested literature, constitute the best introduction to the history, thought, worship, and present situation of the Episcopal Church.

A more formal bibliography of the history of the Episcopal Church is R. S. Bosher's "The Episcopal Church and American Christianity, a bibliography" in *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Vol. 19 (1950). This bibliography was originally designed for use in the first course in American church history at the General Theological Seminary, New York City. It is a classified list of histories and studies arranged around the topics of lectures which, in turn, form a chronological conspectus of the progress of Anglicanism in the American colonies and in the United States. Some attention is paid to the religious environment of

---

NIELS H. SONNE, B.D., Ph.D., is Librarian of the General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City. This article is the third of a series dealing with bibliographical resources for study of the history of the major denominations.

Episcopalianism. Although not annotated, Dr. Bosher's work is the most useful bibliography for the reader who is interested strictly in the history of the Church. The bibliography appended to W. W. Manross' *A History of the American Episcopal Church* (second edition, revised and enlarged, New York, 1950), is a classified list of printed sources rather than of histories and studies, and is of chief value for the reader who wishes to get his story from the original actors and who has access to their works. Another scholarly bibliography, alphabetical in arrangement and informatively annotated, is found in E. C. Chorley's Hale lectures for 1946, *Men and Movements in the American Episcopal Church* (New York, 1946). J. T. Addison's *The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931* (New York, 1951) is a popular history of the Episcopal Church, and its bibliography is merely a brief list of books cited.

The two bibliographical monographs in Volume Two of Bishop W. S. Perry's *The History of the American Episcopal Church, 1587-1883* (Boston, 1885), the classic nineteenth-century history of the Church, are well worth noting. Monograph Number Nine, "The Literary Churchmen of the Ante-revolutionary Period" by Henry Coppée, provides a discursive treatment of such pr REVOLUTIONARY writers as were associated with the colonial Church. Monograph Number Ten, "Church Literature since the Revolution" by J. H. Ward, is a bibliographical essay on Church writers and their publications in the first century of the Episcopal Church. It is far more concerned with the literature of Church affairs than Coppée's essay, and is of great value for its appraisals of the men and works it discusses. Ward attempts to put his writers and their publications in proper party relationships. His essay is the best bibliographical starting point for research in the century it covers; but its arrangement is poor for reference purposes and its inadequate bibliographical detail necessitates supplementary use of other bibliographies.

The Episcopal Church has a large literature of diocesan and parish history. Quality varies widely from well conceived and competently executed historical writings to mere antiquarian compilations. Perhaps the ablest of the older diocesan histories is E. E. Beardsley's *The History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, 2 volumes (Boston, 1866-68 and later editions), with a brief bibliography in Volume One. *The Centennial History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York, 1785-1885*, edited by J. G. Wilson (New York, 1886), contains an instructive bibliographical essay, "Church literature of the century," written by J. A. Spencer, in which the writings of the principal figures in the history

of the Diocese of New York are discussed. The best modern regional bibliography covering the colonial history of the present Dioceses of Newark and New Jersey is that prepared by N. R. Burr for his *Anglican Church in New Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1954). In addition to an excellent classified general bibliography, Burr provides a special bibliography of "Published works of the New Jersey Colonial Clergy" with locations of extant copies of the works of the seventeen writers he considers. The Diocese of Kentucky has been the subject of W. R. Insko's "A short bibliography of the history of the Episcopal Church in Kentucky" in the *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society*, 53 (1955).

Useful diocesan bibliographies are also found in G. E. De Mille's *A History of the Diocese of Albany, 1705-1923* (Philadelphia, 1946); G. M. Brydon's *Virginia's Mother Church*, Volume 1, 1607-1727 (Richmond, 1947) and Volume 2, 1727-1923 (Philadelphia, 1952); G. F. Smythe's *History of the Diocese of Ohio Until . . . 1918* (Cleveland, 1931), and other diocesan histories. Du Bose Murphy's *A Short History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Texas* (Dallas, 1935) contains a brief bibliography of the Church in the state of Texas. N. W. Rightmyer provides a good annotated bibliography in his *Anglican Church in Delaware* (Philadelphia, 1947). An interesting special feature of this work is the reprint of "A catalogue of the missionaries' library" from *A Collection of Papers, Printed by Order of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (London, 1788).

Another important source for diocesan history and bibliography is the inventory of church archives produced by the WPA Historical Records Survey. Volumes were prepared for the following dioceses of the Episcopal Church: Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Washington (D. C.), Maryland, Michigan, Northern Michigan, Western Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, Newark and New Jersey (in one volume), New Hampshire, New York (Manhattan, the Bronx, and Richmond only), Long Island (Queens and Brooklyn only), Western New York, Rochester, West Virginia, and Fond du Lac (in Wisconsin). All were published between 1938 and 1942. The text follows a consistent pattern in providing a general history of the diocese under consideration and brief histories of the individual parishes, arranged and numbered in chronological order of foundation. The bibliographical features include descriptions and locations of local archives and bibliographies of the sources upon which the text of the volume as a whole rests.

Local or parish histories range from the monumental *A History of*

*the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York*, four volumes edited by Morgan Dix, with a fifth volume by L. C. Lewis (New York, 1898-1906, 1950), to the innumerable minor historical sketches prepared for various purposes and occasions by individual churches. Bibliographies of parish histories are not numerous and are usually found in diocesan histories and in the Historical Records Survey volumes. The better parish histories contain bibliographies, and in a work such as Dix's *Trinity Church*, they reach a high level of excellence. In an effort to improve the writing of parish histories, the Church Historical Society has published an instructive pamphlet on principles and methods by the experienced parish historian, N. R. Burr, *Adventures in Parish History* (Philadelphia, 1947).

A few topical histories contain bibliographies worthy of special attention. C. H. Brewer presents a classified list of the works from which he garnered his materials in his *A History of Religious Education in the Episcopal Church to 1835* (New Haven, 1924). In presenting the bibliography of his *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies* (New York, 1902), A. L. Cross wrote: "This bibliography aims to include all books, manuscripts, pamphlets, newspapers, periodicals, broadsides, official records, or other collections of material which contain important information regarding the relations between the Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies." Cross's book remains, after half a century, the standard work on this topic. F. J. Klingberg, whose writings are described by Dr. Rightmyer as "exceptionally well documented," provides "A Select Bibliography" in his *Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York* (Philadelphia, 1940). This bibliography is useful in opening the subject of the Church in relation to slavery and to the American Indians in the Colonial period.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

The best biographical work for the more important American Episcopalians is the *Dictionary of American Biography*, 21 volumes (New York, 1928-1937). In this work 262 Episcopal clergymen, including 92 bishops, are given good biographical treatment, with appended bibliographies. *Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, six volumes (New York, 1894), contains 488 biographies of Episcopal clergymen, including 159 bishops. Some bibliographical information is included in these articles. W. H. Stone in his "List of Episcopal Clergymen in 'Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography' and in the 'Dictionary of American Biography,'" *The Historical Magazine* 23 (1954), finds that the DAB and Appletons' overlap to include together biographies of 548 clergymen, of

whom 173 were bishops. English clergymen are treated in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (London, 1885-1901), which includes some men of importance in American church history, as, for example, Thomas Bray, George Berkeley, and George Keith. For the older clergy, Volume 5 of William B. Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit* (New York, 1869) is devoted to the Episcopal clergy and includes 336 biographies. In compiling this work, Sprague continued his usual technique of procuring materials from contemporaries and acquaintances of the subjects. He discusses the writings of his subjects at some length.

The bishops of the Episcopal Church have been the topics of a biographical work by Bishop W. S. Perry, *The Bishops of the American Church, Past and Present, Sketches Biographical and Bibliographical* (New York, 1897). Each of the 184 sketches is accompanied by a note entitled "Works." While often helpful and suggestive, these notes lack bibliographical precision. Worthy of attention also is C. R. Barnes' biographical work, *The General Convention, Offices and Officers, 1785-1950* (Philadelphia, 1951) which includes as Appendix I, "Book List. Principal Writings of the Persons Mentioned in this Study," and Appendix II, "Bibliography." Bibliographical material is also found in the obituary notices sometimes printed in diocesan journals and in the lives which are a normal feature of diocesan and parish histories.

Outline biographical information for most Episcopalian clergymen of this century can best be found in the *Clerical Directory* (formerly *Stowe's Clerical Directory*) which has appeared nineteen times in the past fifty-nine years. The current volume, published in 1956, provides brief statements of the ecclesiastical careers of the more than 8,000 clergymen of the Church, including in addition birth, parentage, special activities, and lists of publications. These listings are bibliographically incomplete but have the positive value of providing the fullest statement of publications which the authors themselves deem worthy of notice. A new feature of the 1953 volume was the printing of group pictures of the clergy of each diocese (with a few exceptions), usually taken at the annual conventions. Each clergyman is identified. The more prominent Episcopal clergymen appear also in *Who's Who in America* and, after death, in *Who Was Who in America*.

#### SOURCE MATERIALS

Two scholarly Episcopalian, F. L. Hawks and W. S. Perry, made efforts in the middle nineteenth century to place in print important unpublished materials relating to the Church, which might otherwise be lost.

Their joint efforts had a small but valuable yield. With Hawks as editor, the Protestant Episcopal Historical Society brought forth Volume One of its *Collections* in 1851. This is of special value for its material on George Keith and John Talbot, early eighteenth-century missionaries. In 1863-64, Hawks and Perry brought out their *Documentary History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Containing numerous hitherto unpublished documents concerning the Church in Connecticut* (New York, 1863-64). Later, Perry was able to publish five folio volumes of *Historical Collection Relating to the American Colonial Church* (Hartford, 1870-78), covering Virginia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Delaware. These volumes were based on transcripts made in England under F. C. Hawks' direction.

A major printed source for the colonial church is the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel's *Abstract of Proceedings, 1704-1783*. The Library of Congress has also been active in gathering photo-reproductions of materials in English libraries relevant to the Church of England in colonial America. This work is described in N. R. Burr's *Anglican Church in New Jersey* (p. 658). Another notable project for the publication of Episcopal source materials is the Virginia State Library's series of volumes reproducing the prerevolutionary vestry books and registers of various parishes in Virginia. Mention should also be made of *Archives of the General Convention* edited by order of the Commission on Archives, by Arthur Lowndes, six volumes (New York, 1911-12). In spite of the inclusive title, this set contains only the correspondence of Bishop J. H. Hobart, from 1757 to 1811. Each volume has a special bibliography and there is a list of the writings of Bishop Hobart.

#### PERIODICALS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

The chief popular periodicals of the Episcopal Church are *The Living Church* (founded 1878); *The Churchman* (founded 1831); *Forth* (founded as *The Spirit of Missions* in 1836); *The Witness* (founded 1916); and *The Episcopal Church News* (founded as *The Southern Churchman* in 1835). For studies of Episcopal history and affairs, with many bibliographies, pre-eminence must be given to *The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, which commenced publication in 1932. Diocesan periodicals being published at the present time are listed in *The Episcopal Church Annual*. A long list of Episcopal magazines represented by files in the General Theological Seminary Library is to be found in Charles Mampoteng's "The Library and American Church His-

tory" in *The Historical Magazine* 5 (1936). C. P. Morehouse, for nineteen years editor of *The Living Church*, has discussed the early Episcopal press at length in his "Origins of the Episcopal Church Press from Colonial Days to 1840" in *The Historical Magazine* 11 (1942). Chapters are devoted to the founding and early years of *The Churchman*, *The Southern Churchman*, and *The Spirit of Missions*, with brief surveys of their history from 1840 to 1942. The article is equipped with a bibliography.

#### OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

The General Convention of the Episcopal Church meets triennially. Its proceedings, documented with extensive reports, are published as the *Journal of The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* after each convention. The proceedings of the early conventions have been republished three times, in 1817, 1861, and 1874. The clergy and laity of the individual dioceses and of the missionary districts meet annually in convention, and in almost all cases their proceedings are also published. The constitution and canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church are subject to revision at each General Convention and the revised constitution is published both separately and as part of the *Journal* after each convention. In 1924, E. A. White published an annotated edition of the Constitutions and Canons. This has been revised recently by J. A. Dykman, and the new edition was published by the Seabury Press in 1954. In this work, the successive forms of each canon and additions to the canons are presented, with necessary commentary. The American Episcopal Church is a federation of individual dioceses. Each of these dioceses has its own canons and constitution, subject to change from time to time. The dioceses publish their constitutions and canons, and their journals contain all alterations and amendments which have been passed.

#### THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

No informed study of the Episcopal Church is possible without attention to its worship. On the popular level, the most instructive study is M. H. Shepherd's *The Worship of the Church* (Greenwich, 1952) in the Church's Teaching Series. A more detailed work is E. L. Parsons and B. H. Jones, *The American Prayer Book* (New York, 1937). Both of these books contain excellent bibliographies. The form of presentation and the annotations make Shepherd's work of special use to the beginner. Readers seeking a list of the important editions of the *Book of Common*

*Prayer*, with explanatory annotations, will find this in *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Book of Common Prayer and related material in the collection of James R. Page* (Los Angeles, 1955).

#### YEARBOOKS

The standard yearbook of the Episcopal Church is *The Episcopal Church Annual*, for many years edited by C. P. Morehouse. This first appeared in 1892 as the *Living Church Annual*. In 1922 it absorbed the *Churchman's Year Book and American Church Annual*, which had been founded in 1830 as *The Churchman's Almanac* and had appeared under three other similar names. In 1909, it absorbed *Whittaker's Churchman's Almanac*, founded in 1854. The present name, *The Episcopal Church Annual*, was adopted in 1953. The volume presents the usual yearbook type of information, including biographies of newly consecrated bishops, lists of the episcopal succession in America, and the lists of the living American clergy, complete as reported. Also listed are parishes, with addresses and number of communicants, under diocese. A list of church periodicals, general and diocesan, is a useful bibliographical feature. Mr. Morehouse has published an instructive article on this type of publication, "Almanacs and Year Books of the Episcopal Church" in *The Historical Magazine* 10 (1941).

#### DOCTORAL THESES

Previous articles in this series have discussed doctoral dissertations in their fields. The American Episcopal Church has not been the subject of many such theses. Of the relevant theses listed in *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities, 1934* to date, six seem to be concerned primarily with historical subjects. They are R. L. Arends, *Early American Methodism and the Church of England* (Yale, 1948); C. N. Brickley, *The Episcopal Church in Protestant America, 1800-1860* (Clark, 1950); W. A. Bultmann, *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts and the Foreign Settler in the American Colonies* (California, 1952); F. D. Gifford, *The Church of England in Colonial Westchester: a Study of the Work of the S.P.G. Missionaries in the Parishes of West Chester, Rye and New Rochelle* (New York University, 1942); W. W. Manross, *The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1800-1840* (Columbia, 1939), published by the Columbia University Press in 1938; and L. U. Ridout, *Foundation of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of California, 1849-1893* (Southern California, 1953).

Other doctoral theses, arranged alphabetically by author, are: L. A. Belford, *Marriage and Canon Law in the Protestant Episcopal Church* (U.S.A.) (Columbia, 1933), published by University Microfilms; H. L. King, Jr., *The Doctrine of Conscience in Contemporary Anglo-Catholic Theology* (Columbia, 1951), published by University Microfilms; C. O. Loveland, *The Problem of Achieving Agreement on the Form of Government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, 1780-1789* (Duke, 1953), to be published in April, 1956, as *The Critical Years: the Reconstitution of the Anglican Church in the United States of America, 1780-1789*, by the Seabury Press in Greenwich, Conn.; J. H. Scambler, *The Anglican Synthesis (Catholic and Evangelical)* (Northern Baptist, 1953); S. A. Temple, *The Common Sense Theology of Bishop White: Selected Essays from the Writings of William White, 1748-1836 . . . with an Introductory Survey of his Theological Position* (Columbia, 1946), published by the King's Crown Press in 1946; E. G. Waring, Jr., *Philosophical Aspects of Recent Anglo-Catholic Thought* (Chicago, 1950); and M. M. Weston, *Social Policy of the Episcopal Church in the Twentieth Century* (Columbia, 1954), published by University Microfilms.

#### LOCATIONS OF COLLECTIONS

Bibliographical discussions stress printed listings of books. There is also need for discussions of the locations of major collections. In the Episcopal Church, the Church Historical Society is the official instrument of the General Convention for the preservation of historical records. Long located at the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, the library of this organization will soon move to the Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, in Austin, Texas. The resources of this library were described by the present librarian, Dr. W. W. Manross, in the June, 1955, issue of *The Historical Magazine*. Dr. W. H. Stowe of New Brunswick, N. J., is president of the Church Historical Society, as well as Historiographer of the Church, editor of *The Historical Magazine* and of *The Historiographer*. The Historical Society publishes a series of *Publications* in which several of the works cited in this article have appeared. Individual dioceses also often designate a historiographer. Some diocesan historiographers are quite active in this capacity, as, for examples, K. W. Cameron in Connecticut and G. M. Brydon in Virginia.

Other major libraries for the study of the Episcopal Church are the General Theological Seminary Library in New York City, the Trinity

College Library in Hartford, Conn., and the Massachusetts Diocesan Library in Boston. The historical resources in manuscripts and periodicals of the Seminary library are described by Charles Mampoteng in his "The Library and American Church History" in *The Historical Magazine* for September, 1936. Important additions, including the H. C. Robbins collection of bishops' autographs and most of Bishop Samuel Seabury's papers, have been made since 1936. The Massachusetts Diocesan Library's collection of over 20,000 manuscripts is described in detail in the Historical Records Society's *A Description of the Manuscript Collections in the Massachusetts Diocesan Library* (Boston, 1939). Some state libraries, such as that in Connecticut, have systematically collected records of Episcopal Churches, either in originals or photocopies, for permanent preservation. The student should also recall that much important early Episcopal material is included in the great public and university libraries under the heading "Americana."

## Book Reviews

**Like a Mighty Army (Moves the Church of God).** By CHARLES W. CONN.  
Cleveland, Tennessee: Church of God Publishing House, 1955, xxiv-380 pp.  
\$5.00.

A book of history with a heart is something of an achievement, and historian Conn has achieved unusually well.

As everyone familiar with Church Street, U.S.A. knows, there are few typically American faiths. Christian Science is one. Mormonism is another. Jehovah's Witnesses is a third. There are others, but the most solid of them, as far as Protestant tradition is concerned, is the Pentecostal-Holiness movement. It was born in revivals and nourished in the enthusiasm of a neo-apostolic zeal.

Among the mightiest of the Pentecostal groups are the various Churches of God, and among the most significant and influential of these is the Church of God with headquarters in Cleveland, Tennessee. This denomination is not to be confused with the Winebrennerian Churches of God or with the Churches of God, Holiness. It is not the same as the Church of God, Anderson, Indiana, or the Original Church of God, or the Tomlinson Church of God.

The Church of God, Cleveland, Tennessee, was formed in Monroe County, Tennessee, in 1886 under the name "Christian Union." In 1902 there was a re-organization with the title "Holiness Church." In 1907 it adopted the name "Church of God." It began with the conviction of a number of people from various denominations in Tennessee, that the churches to which they belonged were not truly "Scriptural churches" and that what they lacked most of all was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Conn's assignment was to examine the record of this conviction from its beginning until the present. The result is a thoroughgoing description and a penetrating analysis of the events which brought this particular holiness group into being and established it as one of the most virile of American faiths.

The compelling title, a line from "Onward Christian Soldiers," carries an inference which song writer Baring-Gould did not have in mind. The curate wrote his hymn for children who liked to play soldier. Conn wrote his book for men and women who, he feels, have withstood the theological revolutions and shifting battles of the creeds of the past century.

The Church of God is certainly not a military-minded denomination. In its early period it advocated against participation in war as far as its members were concerned. That position, happily or unhappily according to one's point of view, has been revised. Today the Church of God leaves it up to the individual what he should do in the matter. It is quite prepared to defend the position of a member who believes that military service is incompatible with the teachings of Christ.

In a very real sense Conn's historical treatise is a defense of distinctives among this particular holiness group. He recognizes that many Church of God beliefs still continue to set apart this denomination as a "peculiar people."

Most of the established Protestant churches accept the "Baptism of the Holy Spirit" as a happy phrase of fellowship with God. Most churches are quite ready to admit that something of a highly metaphysical nature happened on that "first Pentecost" and that Acts 2 reports some sort of mystical vitality in the early church. The breaking point between the Church of God and traditional Protestantism is not in the historical but in the dispensational factor. No matter what happened in the

"Upper Room," the churches of the Reformation are reluctant to believe that the charismata were intended for widespread operation in modern times. But the Church of God insists that the gift of miracles, strongly evident in primitive Christianity, remains as constant proof of divinity in the true church of Christ and will remain so until the end of time. Conn points out that St. Paul bears out this "truth" and that one need only read I Cor. 4:11 to come around to the belief that the Holy Spirit will never leave the modern church without its substantial witness.

There are other Church of God distinctives which the historian explains in the light of history and Scripture. He explains the ever controversial points of sanctification, the verbal inspiration of the Bible, justification, regeneration, divine healing. He justifies the taboo on tobacco, liquor, wearing of jewelry, membership in secret societies, and other disciplines. How the Church of God interprets the plan of salvation and what it looks for in the premillennial Second Coming of Jesus are all part of this comprehensive and consecrated work.

This history of the Church of God moves forward in the lives of "intrepid, Holy Ghost-filled men." It traces the aspiration of the Pentecostal followers backward into a renewal of the Upper Room experience and forward into an application of this experience in modern life.

In its immediate context the book is a study of adjusting institutionalized religion to life without uprooting, more than necessary, the ancient landmarks of faith. Any "outside reader" will be tempted to agree, under Conn's persuasive style, that the primal faith of the Church of God has been kept singularly stable and effective throughout the pressure of conflict and trial. Antagonism against the denomination made its early years difficult and precarious, but it also served to draw the Holy Ghost believers into closer fellowship. The greater the persecution, the greater the growth. Homes were burned and their churches were dynamited. Violence against the movement continued until 1902, and even today there is resentment against the Church of God because of its literal interpretation of the Holy Ghost experience.

Conn believes that the Church of God of which he writes has a legal and spiritual right to being considered the oldest and the original church of God in America. Largest of the Pentecostal-Holiness churches of God, it has a membership of approximately 130,000.

*Like a Mighty Army* will find a ready place in the homes of Church of God members and will certainly serve as a valuable text and reference in the Church's academies and Bible colleges. It should also be of interest to other independent, pentecostal, evangelical assemblies who make Acts 2 the *élan vital* of their faith. For non-Pentecostals the volume is important for its clarification of Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) teachings and its account of how conviction and zeal can triumph over defection and distrust. Whether we like it or not, it may be that there is a certain parallelism between military strategy and the institutionalized expression of the Gospel of Christ.

MARCUS BACH

Professor at the School of Religion, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

**Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue.** By MAURICE S. FRIEDMAN. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955. x-310 pp. \$6.00.

Maurice Friedman, professor of philosophy at Sarah Lawrence College, has written in this volume the first full-length study of the thought of Martin Buber, the leading Jewish philosopher of our time. His book is designed as "an introduction

to Buber's works for those who have not yet read him and as a commentary and systematic presentation for those who have." Two themes are dominant in this study of Buber's thought: his philosophy of dialogue, and his attitude toward the nature and redemption of evil. On the second of these points, the book shows perhaps too much evidence that it grew out of the author's doctoral dissertation, which was subtitled "A Study in the Redemption of Evil." No one can deny that the present subtitle indicates the real focus of Buber's thought, and that the redemption of evil is only one among many implications of his understanding of the divine-human encounter. Every one of these implications is elaborated in this book; and the author is very learned in the field of contemporary theology yet very perceptive of the open issues for modern thought, and a fine writer. He has established himself as the leading interpreter of Buber to the English-speaking world.

The first 53 pages give an account of the development of Buber's ideas "from his earliest essays in 1900 to the statement of his mature philosophy in 1922," or "from an early period of mysticism through a middle period of existentialism to a final period of developing dialogical philosophy." Of greatest importance was Buber's break with the Jewish Enlightenment, under the influence of Hasidism (the popular mystical movement that swept East European Jewry in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, whose name derives from the Hebrew word, *hesed*, lovingkindness), and Buber's return from these mystical heights to the everyday.

Mainly, however, the book is systematic or constructive in character, and one wonders whether the historical analysis might not have been made within the later chapters. Certainly Buber's earlier distinction between man's orienting himself toward the world (whence arise space and time and the world of objects) and his realizing himself in the world of real existence was but another way of formulating the distinction between "I-It" and "I-Thou" encounters which is Buber's decisive contribution to modern thought. In any case, for this reviewer the book really weighs anchor with Part Three, "Dialogue." It might be suggested that someone who has not read Buber before should begin here, with a copy of *I and Thou* and *Between Man and Man* beside him.

"All real living is meeting." There in-between man and man, and man and God, is to be found man's authentic being in the world: this is Buber's salutary word to people in this period of objectifying speculation and mass communications. All real existence as a human being takes place in that "distancing" and "relating" by which the other person is "made present" to oneself.

Part Five, "Between Man and Man," opens with a chapter on Buber's theory of knowledge, and then draws out the implications of Buber's thought for the fields of education, psychology, ethics, and social philosophy. At every point of essential human concern, one sees the significance of a viewpoint which not only walks the "narrow ridge" between individualism and collectivism but also gives real substance to the human reality that ought not to be violated if man is to endure. Part Six, "Between Man and God," in separate chapters considers "Symbol, Myth and History," "The Faith of the Bible," "Buber and Judaism," and "Buber and Christianity." Here one sees the enormous significance of Buber for contemporary philosophy, biblical studies, and even for Christian theology.

One of Friedman's chief contentions is that Buber's view of the reality yet redeemability of evil possesses strength—the strength of nondualism—which is inevitably lost when his philosophy of dialogue is taken over by Christian theology. It

is doubtless true that Christian theology past and present has frequently erred in formulating its view of original sin and God's redemptive relation to man in such a way as to treat evil as a thing-in-itself from which man needs to be saved but which itself is not salvable. But the question is whether in some measure dualism be not necessary if all evil is to be redeemed.

Buber treats evil in its first coming into the human world as *decisionlessness*; and it appears possible for men either by decision or by decisionlessness and unfreedom to place themselves in a state of wickedness beyond the reach of redemption. This can be seen in the words with which Buber accepted the award of the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade in 1953 (of course, against the background of the Nazi horrors, any words spoken by such a man as Buber have the quality of nobility): "With those who took part in this action in any capacity, I, one of the survivors, have only in a formal sense a common humanity. They have so radically removed themselves into a sphere of monstrous inhumanity, inaccessible to my power of conception, that not even hatred, much less an overcoming of hatred, was able to arise in me. And who am I that I could here presume to 'forgive'!"

By way of contrast, Christian theology, especially an existentialist Christian theology, defines (original) sin and wickedness (for all the supervening unfreedom) as *decision*; and this has not the effect of removing it into an ontological realm by itself remote from God. Instead, sin, no matter how much potentiated, and wickedness, no matter how dehumanized, find their decisive "meeting" with the crucified "image" of God who chooses to suffer in the face of man's decisions. This is a duality *within* encounter; and without it, some of the evil there is would never be met redemptively. It would seem that, if the issue is the redemption of evil, Jew and Christian alike in their equal unbelief may well pray (as did Thomas Hardy when he heard it said that even the animals in the stable adored the Christ-child), that it might be so.

PAUL RAMSEY

Professor of Religion, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

**Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy.** By GEORGE F. THOMAS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955. xvi-539 pp. \$5.75.

Professor Thomas has addressed himself to one of the crucial problems of modern Christianity, the relation between religion and morals. The behavior of so many Christians in Germany in the face of the rise of Nazism, the success of Communism in such a large segment of the world, the apparent increase in a religiously based withdrawal from the pressing problems of practical life—these are a few of the considerations that make the topic of this book a vital one. Is religion a real practical force? Should it be such a force? No more serious question faces us.

This book approaches its problem by an argument in four parts. Part I gives a historical survey of the various developments of Christian thought on moral matters. Part II discusses Christian doctrines of man, and Part III Christian views of society. Part IV is a critical examination of a number of moral philosophies.

In the historical presentation, Dr. Thomas is primarily concerned to make clear the sense in which the Old Testament concept of law is transformed by the Christian concept of love into a new religious principle. By insisting upon reasonableness, in the light of conditions in our world, in interpreting the teachings of Jesus, he rejects literal meanings for a practicable doctrine of love and law. And he proceeds to

demonstrate this practicableness by applying Christian principles to an array of moral problems. He also traces the ups and downs of his interpretation as Christian doctrine has developed from Paul to John Wesley.

The Christian view of man Thomas presents is a familiar one: man as image of God, man as sinner, and man as redeemed by God's grace. The Christian attitude toward society is described as an active one. Since it is only on this view of Christianity that Christianity can be said to constitute an ethics, special stress is laid on the Christian's concern with worldly problems—sex and marriage, social justice, politics, economics, racial tensions, and war. The author gives historical reasons for the strain of conservatism and political indifference that runs through Christianity. But he argues effectively that love which does not manifest itself actively in all of life falls short of the love Christ taught.

Professor Thomas discusses secular moral philosophies under these headings: happiness, duty, value, and character. Each of these classes of moral theory has its peculiar weaknesses, but they all share four principal limitations—lack of motivation, the danger of moral pride and complacency, the lack of an imaginative vision, and the lack of an incarnation of the ideal. He recognizes the fact that Christian ethics must rely heavily on secular moral philosophy for its *content*, but he procures this content by selection from the various philosophic approaches and rejection of all the theories themselves as inadequate. And there is no systematic statement of the principles which underlie his applications of the law of Christian love.

In admitting the necessity of a moral foundation for his religious ethics, Dr. Thomas is avoiding a fairly common pitfall of religionists. The subject matter of moral philosophy is action, and good must be defined in terms of action. The law of love must have some moral guidance; without proper direction, it can be immoral as well as moral in its workings. The only source we have for knowledge of moral good and evil is the nature of human action. And, as the author points out, basic Christian literature deals more explicitly with relations among men in the kingdom of God than with their relations in this world. The Sermon on the Mount is not a set of practical precepts for dealing with immediate problems in a sinful world. Yet, Dr. Thomas insists, Christianity must come to grips with these immediate problems in order really to fulfill its religious meaning.

However, does an eclecticism such as is here indicated satisfactorily supply a moral base for a religious ethics? In the case of a philosopher operating with his own validly derived moral principles, an eclectic method of exposition of the meaning of his principles can be valuable and forceful. He has a *moral* basis for selection and rejection of aspects of other moral theories. But if the religionist does not utilize a moral theory, and if he is not doing the moral philosopher's job of analyzing action, no selective principle is available to him other than a religiously grounded emotional reaction.

The religious concept of man as embodying the spirit of God, on the one hand, and the depravity of sin, on the other, is of little help in trying to arrive at a theory of moral values. Such a concept seems to preclude any human solution to the question of values and, hence, any solution at all short of divine revelation. And the question of the authenticity of any revelation must take us right back to some concept of good, which is what we were seeking in the first place.

F. H. Bradley has said, "Ethics issues in religion," and this sequence appears to be mandatory. Religion does strengthen moral motives—but there have to be

*moral* motives to be strengthened. Religion does make for humility—if it has the proper moral foundation. Religion does provide an image and an incarnation of the ideal—which provision is beneficial or pernicious according to the nature of the ideal. Religion can transform moral philosophy, but the result depends upon both the validity of the religious insight and that of the moral theory. Religious fervor can be destructive as well as creative, or it can spend itself in an inward emotional conflagration. The real inadequacies of moral philosophy will only be magnified by a religious transformation. A Christian ethics will have to be able to look with respect, rather than pity or scorn, upon whatever moral theory forms its underpinnings.

E. DARNELL RUCKER

Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

**Changing Conceptions of Original Sin.** By H. SHELTON SMITH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955. xi-242 pp. \$3.50.

In a time when the idea of "Original Sin" is receiving a measure of renewed interest, whether under the guise of Neo-Orthodoxy, Realism, Neo-Liberalism, or some other convenient title, this comprehensive review of the history of the idea of original sin in American Christian thought is most welcome.

For many years Professor Smith has devoted himself to the combined task of making himself the master of the intricacies of American religious thought patterns and of laying open those patterns with deep earnestness and remarkable clarity to his students. Thus it comes about that his readers may turn to his publications with the anticipation that the work will be marked by the happy combination of penetrating scholarship with lucid, readable style.

The reader will not be disappointed in *Changing Conceptions of Original Sin*. Professor Smith begins by laying a solid foundation for the entire study in the initial chapter on "The Federal Doctrine of Original Sin." Here he discusses in detail the scholasticized version of John Calvin's doctrine of Original Sin which marked the thought not only of the Congregational New England divines but of their Presbyterian counterparts in the middle and southern colonies.

Chapters Two through Five are given to the discussion of the inroads of rationalism upon the doctrine. Chapter Two deals with the crucial impact of the English liberals Daniel Whitby and John Taylor, with the latter being largely responsible for laying the groundwork of the later attack by American liberals on the Calvinist doctrine. It is interesting, in passing, to note how fully this chapter cuts the roots from under the rather conventional assertion in the interpretation of American Christianity, that a home-grown rationalism is one of the definitive marks of the "Americanization" of Christianity. In reaction against Taylorism came the important modification of the strict Calvinist argument by Jonathan Edwards and his successors, and at this point the reader senses how the battle will go; for when "Calvinists" begin to modify "Calvinism" the first great retreat has been made.

Chapter Three treats of the spread of Taylorism through the medium of Samuel Webster and Charles Chauncey, with an assist from Jonathan Mayhew.

The fight to maintain some semblance of a "Calvinist" doctrine of original sin was carried on by Samuel Hopkins, Nathaniel Emmons, and Timothy Dwight. Professor Smith takes pains to make clear how closely the arguments of these later so-called Calvinists actually parallel the earlier arguments of Taylor. While the Calvinists were trying to rebuild their theory, and splitting between Edwardians and

Old Calvinists in the process, the liberals were slowly but surely moving to the position which finally came out in open revolt against Calvinism under the title "Unitarianism." Heading the Unitarian charge were William Ellery Channing and Henry Ware. Leading the Calvinists, now united in opposition to Unitarianism, was Leonard Woods. This is the substance of Chapter Four.

Chapters Five and Six open up the new position advanced by Nathaniel W. Taylor and his cohorts of the New Haven Theology. It was this modification of Calvinism that turned the battle in upon the Calvinists themselves, to the not totally concealed delight of their liberal opponents. The long struggle between Taylor and his Calvinist alter ego, Bennet Tyler, augmented by the arguments of the lesser contestants such as Chauncey Goodrich and Joseph Harvey, led to grave difficulties within both Congregationalism and Presbyterianism, and at length left not a few theologians sick and tired of the conflict.

An effort to reach new ground brought the essentially practical approach of Horace Bushnell on the scene. In his seventh chapter Professor Smith follows out Bushnell's position, a position which in his time "was uniquely his own" but which speaks with surprising relevancy a hundred years later.

Meantime the onslaught of Darwinism and "scientism" had led many of the leaders of the liberal wing to repudiate outright not only any connection with a doctrine of original sin, but with the very interpretations of man which had moved even their liberal predecessors. The "New Theology" of T. T. Munger, Newman Smyth, George A. Gordon, Washington Gladden, and Lyman Abbott among the preachers; of Lewis F. Stearns, George Harris, William Newton Clarke, and Williams Adams Brown among the professors of theology, paved the way for the faith in moral progress and optimism about the basic nature of man which was to obscure so thoroughly any understanding of the significance of human sin in the last years of the nineteenth century and the opening years of the twentieth century. This is Chapter Nine.

To this denial of human sin only one great contemporary voice spoke out, that of Walter Rauschenbusch; and he spoke with authority only late in his life after the outbreak of the "impossible war," World War I, had led him to a soul-searching reconstruction of his theology. Rauschenbusch does not go back to Calvinism, far from it, but he does believe profoundly in human sin and guilt, both individual and collective, and he pleads for a more realistic and perceptive interpretation of human nature and of the "human predicament." His plea reaches some measure of answer in the thought of Reinhold Niebuhr and Paul Tillich, both of whom base their systems on concepts of the "fall" and "original sin." Their concepts, however, are so far removed from the "federal" concept with which the study began, as to make it clear both how far American Christian thought has removed from the early Calvinist traditions and how impossible it is now to try to recover a tenable Calvinist position.

With the discussion of Rauschenbusch, Niebuhr and Tillich, Professor Smith brings the study to an abrupt halt. The reader may long for a summation, some reflections upon the study, but this is not the author's purpose. From beginning to end he is rigorously objective, resolutely allowing his thinkers to speak for themselves without impinging himself upon their thought forms any more than is necessary for purposes of organization of the material. He refuses to break this pattern to provide a conventional "conclusion."

Enhanced by good footnotes which the publishers have generously printed with the text, and followed by an adequate index, this book is a "must" in the area of

American Christian thought for anyone who would try to understand American Christianity and its special place in contemporary theology.

RICHARD C. WOLF

Associate Professor of Church History, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

**Christ and the Caesars.** By ETHELBERT STAUFFER. Translated by K. and R. Gregor Smith. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. 293 pp. \$4.50.

Presumably not many New Testament scholars are also experts in numismatics, but Ethelbert Stauffer of Erlangen very fruitfully combines these specialties. *Christ and the Caesars* consists of a series of sixteen historical sketches, each with a unity of its own, treating aspects of a common theme. The theme is the Advent Myth as expressed in pagan and early Christian sources, the coming of the long-desired, divinely authenticated deliverer, the founder of an age of peace and glory. In the unfolding of the various phases of this golden dream of the ancient world, extensive use is made of the coins and monuments of the early Empire, as well as of the literary sources.

Very ancient in the East was "the myth of the divine king who would redeem creation from its primeval curse." The wise men who followed the star to Bethlehem bear witness to this expectation, while they become witnesses of Christ's epiphany. That the myth was potent in Roman imperialism is a fact illustrated through the greater part of the volume. Julius Caesar's temple of clemency, and the coins that commemorated his festival of 45 B.C., are linked with this theme. The celebrated *Ludi Saeculares* by which Augustus in 17 B.C. still more dramatically inaugurated the new age—encouraged by the appearance of a strange star and the "Advent" prophecies of Virgil—undoubtedly constituted an impressive testimony to the strength of the religio-social hope in his reign. Other writers on Augustus have told the story of the prolonged festival which culminated in the singing antiphonally by choirs of boys and girls of the "Advent hymn" of Horace, the *Carmen Saeculare*. Here we see how the coins of Augustus gave continuity to the lesson, spreading abroad the tidings of the savior-emperor. The Gospel story is sketched on the background of imperial and Palestinian forms of the political myth. Disillusion followed each high moment of the affirmation of the latter: over against its impermanent results, Christ founded his indestructible Church.

No brief review can suggest the rich abundance of data, and the fascinating originality of interpretation, wrought into the author's discussions of such topics as "Augustus and Cleopatra," "Story of the tribute money," "Nero the world savior," "Domitian and John." Nero and Domitian lose nothing of their repulsiveness as persons in the study of their mad claims to divine honors. A chapter on "Paul and Akiba" shows the parallel situations in which these two great religious leaders suffered martyrdom. Akiba, who is highly praised, was, we may say, even more distinctly than Paul, though not more clearly than Christian martyrs of his own age, a protester against emperor worship and the validity of the political myth. In the latter part of the book we see the sufferings and the victory of the Christians to the time when Constantine, no saint but a great statesman, "aware of the inherent tragedy of politics with its involvement in sin and violence," acknowledged "the grace of God in the Cross of Christ the *conditio sine qua non* of his political life."

This is an unusually charming book of history, and it has been turned into de-

lightful English by K. and R. Gregor Smith. Yet some queries will arise. There is an almost complete absence of documentation. The author explains his decision to omit references by saying, "If the references were full enough to satisfy the expert they would also be so full as to frighten off the non-expert." But even the non-expert may possess a wholesome curiosity and desire a little more information on sources than is here furnished. There are seventeen beautifully executed illustrations, fifteen of which are identified without question. Several of these fifteen seem to need more substantial identification than is supplied. Question may be raised, too, on the author's wholly adverse judgment of Seneca in which he utilizes the vilifying sketch by Dio Cassius, a historian not regarded as a model of impartiality. But the book sheds a great light on the religious and political environment of the early Church, and its merits vastly outweigh its defects.

JOHN T. MCNEILL

Emeritus Professor, Union Theological Seminary; Visiting Professor of Church History, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

**The Unity of the Bible.** By H. H. ROWLEY. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. x-201 pp. \$3.50.

With this volume the author adds another excellent work to his already long list of publications in the biblical field. This present work is a continuation of a theme already discussed by the author in various technical journals, a dynamic unity which is to be discovered throughout the Old and New Testaments.

At the outset Dr. Rowley recognizes that there is also diversity in both Testaments and he admits the validity of the historical approach to religion. Nevertheless he feels that the distinguishing feature of the Bible is a continuing thread which transforms a collection of books into The Book. That continuing thread is the election of Israel, an election later transferred to the new Christian community, and the response of the elect to the purposes of God.

Chapters two and three seek to show unity of purpose if not thought between biblical law and prophets, and that the concepts about God and man are consistent in the Testaments and in the major divisions of the Old Testament. Chapters four through six deal in turn with fulfillment in the New Testament of the promise of the Old Testament; the cross as a sign of grace and faith; and the Christian Sacraments as means of fellowship with God, a fellowship envisioned especially by prophetic leaders.

Dr. Rowley finds strong support for the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion as practiced by his own denomination. He is, however, more concerned about the age at which the candidate is baptized than the method of baptism, and it will be remembered that this was the chief concern of early British Baptists. The author also emphasizes that no symbol or sacrament is meaningful except as the worshiper enters into new relationships through them. He says (p. 140), "It is faith into Christ, faith that so identifies a man with Him Who was crucified that instead of being numbered with his crucifiers he becomes one with Christ, and the Cross becomes the organ of his submission of himself to God."

Dr. Rowley also pleads for a balanced interpretation of the Lord's Supper, that it shall include the aspect of memorial, but also sacrifice. Without conceding the Roman Catholic concept of the Mass, he nevertheless states (p. 181), "As an event in history the Cross is unique; yet there is a sense in which it may be repeated." The worshiper must "be crucified with Christ."

In seeking unity of the Bible through theology, the author joins a large number of writers in the field of Biblical Theology. He points out that there is no essential difference, theologically, between the pre-exilic and the post-exilic prophets, as demonstrated by the fact that the post-exilic compilers gave them equal importance in the collection. While recognizing on the one hand (p. 29) that "diversity and unity must be perceived together in the Bible, and neither can be sacrificed to the other," he nevertheless virtually dismisses the importance of the historical study of Old and New Testament religious development. For example he says (p. 54), "To the student of the Bible this is completely immaterial. How ancient the rite may be, and what significance it may have had at first have no bearing on the study of the Bible." Yet he appeals to history to defend his position on the Sacraments and makes no concession to patterns which have been developed in harmony with expanded religious interpretations.

Over against the concept of the development of religion, he says (p. 89): "For our present purpose the historical outlook can dispense with them (developments), since they do not represent moments in the development of the message of the Bible. It is their supersession, or fading away, that is more significant here, since it was in their supersession that the inner dynamic of Israel's faith was seen." It is here that Dr. Rowley will find himself at sharp difference with historians. Unity of Biblical Religion exists (if indeed there is a real unity) only as editors and compilers carefully selected and edited material, and as modern theologians select by standards they may have agreed upon, those passages which support their particular theology.

Dr. Rowley has rendered real service in presenting these studies. The reader will be challenged to think concerning the basic teachings of Christianity. He will agree in the main with the teachings selected by the author. And he will be aided most effectively in his further studies by the excellent bibliographical notations. For the more aggressive readers there is a wealth of additional material in the extensive footnotes. For all who seek to be better informed concerning the biblical source of our faith, this new volume by Dr. Rowley is "must" reading.

WALTER G. WILLIAMS

Professor of Old Testament Literature, The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado.

**Ethics.** By DIETRICH BONHOEFFER. Edited by Eberhard Bethge. Translated by Neville Horton Smith. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. iii-340 pp. \$4.00.

From a concentration camp in April, 1944, Dietrich Bonhoeffer wrote these words in a letter: "I should like to speak of God not on the borders of life but at its centre, not in weakness but in strength, not, therefore, in man's suffering and death but in his life and prosperity." He was skeptical of a Christian apologetic which tried to convince man of his need for Christ by means of existential or psychological analysis. He was equally unhappy with what he called Barth's "positivism of revelation."

Bonhoeffer sought a nonreligious interpretation of Christian life, a way of speaking about God in a secular fashion. He desired a faith which illuminated man's natural life, a life which included art, culture, friendship, and play—all that Kierkegaard had called "esthetic existence"—as well as life characterized by anguish and dread.

The *Ethics* is an expression of this concern. One must say an expression, since it is not a fulfillment but an incomplete and fragmentary sketch of what Bonhoeffer had intended to be a life work. His editor has gathered together chapters written before the War, a few lectures and several sketches set down in the loneliness of his prison cell. Some of it has been lost. It is not so much a book as a detailed project and it must be accepted as such. Sometimes brilliant, often incomplete, it is always suggestive.

Bonhoeffer begins by rejecting all attempts to formulate general ethical principles. The "wise man is aware of the limited receptiveness of reality for principles . . ." (p. 7). He is not concerned with a Christian value-theory, a definition of the good or an ethic of motive. The Christian, he argues, has no principle at his disposal. He seeks, rather, to discover what in a "given situation . . . is necessary and . . . 'right' for him to grasp and do" (p. 197). His problem is, therefore, to seek and find the Will of God and to manifest the Reality of God in his action (p. 55).

Since the Reality of God and his commandment is the ground of ethical action, how is it known? Bonhoeffer is neither a mystic nor a pietist. The Will of God is not a private voice to the conscience. It is manifested in Jesus Christ. Ethics is "conformation" to the Christ; not a static imitation of Jesus but a participation in his life, crucifixion, and resurrection.

The Incarnation justifies the Christian's concern with the world and restores the Natural to its rightful place in Protestant ethics (p. 101). It is in this affirmation of the Natural that Bonhoeffer's distinctive concern is manifest. Protestant ethics, he argues, has in effect handed over the Natural to Catholic ethics by virtue of the former's insistence on the radical nature of the Fall. He wishes to restore it. The Natural "is that which, after the Fall, is directed towards the coming of Christ" (p. 102). It is the form of life preserved by God for the fallen world and directed towards redemption. It includes the four mandates of labor, marriage, government, and the Church. There is, therefore, no separation of Christian life into the secular and sacred. That which is Christian is that which is of the world. Justification and forgiveness enable the faithful to live as deputies in and for the world. They free man for God and his brothers.

It is impossible in so short a space to do justice to the richness of this perspective. Yet even a cursory view reveals some fundamental problems. Is it possible to reconcile an ethic which appeals solely to the Will of God grasped in a concrete situation with an ethic which is founded on the delineation of certain given natural structures, even "laws of being"? (p. 104f., p. 206.) Bonhoeffer insists that ethical discourse can only proceed in a concrete context, that it is "inseparably linked with persons, times and places" (p. 238f.). And yet, on the other hand, Christian life is lived in the presence of "forms of being" which reason can perceive as universal. "Reason understands the natural as something universally established and independent of the possibility of empirical verification" (p. 104).

His insistence on concreteness and the particular situation is very suggestive. In seeking for an ethic which does justice to the ambiguities of moral decision he directs his attention to the context in which decision takes place, a context determined by the mandates of Church, government, labor, culture, etc. He does not begin, therefore, as so many Christian ethicists do, with the self-neighbor model abstracted from all its conditioning relations, a model which inevitably leads to an analysis in which "social ethics" is added to the system as a kind of top-heavy superstructure. Nor does he begin with a rigorous analysis of *Agape* applied to such a self-neighbor relation, an

analysis which is soon weakened by the attempt to do justice to concrete life and its many duties; for *Agape* is qualified by a doctrine of vocation and duties to oneself which raise the question of its relevance. Bonhoeffer begins with man who already finds himself thrown into communities and structures to which he must respond.

In practice, however, Bonhoeffer's ethic is not as concrete or contextualistic as announced. When he turns his hand to particular (concrete?) ethical problems such as suicide, birth control, euthanasia, it is difficult to see how his Christological ethic materially informs his judgments. In most cases he appeals to a "natural right," such as "the right to bodily life" or "the right to nascent life." (A curiously abstract category!) He takes this theory of rights so seriously that it qualifies his insistence on the uniqueness of every situation. Hence, the implication that euthanasia is never justified and the ironic criterion that an "absolutely cogent" argument must be brought forward to justify killing (pp. 112-122). If we live amid relativities, however (and his paragraphs on killing in war assume this), how could one find an "absolutely cogent" argument? Since he argues about "rights," are we not entitled to ask whether these are universal, and if so, in what sense are abstract principles to be rejected?

At other times, Bonhoeffer's ethic is weakened by a curious conservatism which does not appear to have any real relation to his starting point. In his discussion on abortion he writes, "The question whether the life of the mother or the life of the child is of greater value can hardly be a matter of human decision" (p. 131 n.). Whose decision could it possibly be? Are we to leave it to providence? What has become of his insistence on action even when the alternatives are horrifying?

A final note. Those readers accustomed to the categories of Brunner, Nygren, Ramsey, and others may find Bonhoeffer's religious language disconcerting if not occasionally meaningless. A homiletical haze appears to drift over much of the book which doesn't facilitate analysis. What does it mean to say, for example, that "Through the Atonement Jesus Christ has restored the relation between government and God"? (p. 302f.). Or again, "There is no immediate relation between government and God. Christ is its Mediator." (p. 301.)

Nevertheless, the insights of this book are enormously suggestive, all the more so because they were granted to a man who "existed" in his thought and paid the price the Christian Gospel leads one to expect in such cases.

VAN A. HARVEY

Instructor in Religion, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

**The Human Person: An Approach to an Integral Theory of Personality.**

By MAGDA B. ARNOLD and JOHN A. GASSON. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1954. x-593 pp. \$5.75.

The relation between religion and psychology has in recent years become a field of active and fertile research. "Pastoral Psychiatry" has become a familiar term; theological seminaries teach it and many pastors practice it or include psychotherapists on their staff. But until recently the Catholic Church has been highly critical of the conclusions and methods of modern psychology, especially of Freudian psychoanalysis.

Now comes a group of Catholic psychologists to engage in these conversations between psychology and religion, and to appropriate whatever psychiatric learnings and skills they believe can be used in the "cure of souls"—which is, by the way, the literal and historical meaning of "psychiatry." *The Human Person* represents

an admirable survey of the best contemporary Catholic scholarship in the fields of psychology and psychotherapy. Ten Catholic scholars have collaborated in an attempt to formulate an integrated and integral theory of personality based on a realistic and theistic conception of human nature. The essays are irenic and nonpolemical in temper, inclusive in scope (in that they take careful account of recent secular developments and "schools"), and yet they present a *Christian* interpretation—especially in their insistence that the free, responsible *human person* is the proper subject of psychology, and that the study of personality must be set against the background of all the disciplines which deal with the properly human conduct of man. When we study the human person, we must consider man not just as a high-class animal but also as a unique and normative being whose nature is moral and metaphysical.

While these papers are the independent personal product of the editors and contributors, I take it the volume represents an "authoritative" and "authorized" statement, since it bears the *Imprimatur* and the *Nihil Obstat*. There is a minimum of the unmistakable Catholic jargon and apologetics; yet they surrender nothing of dogmatic importance. As a matter of fact, they show that contemporary secular theory seems to be turning back towards the more traditional notion of the self as a precious, interpersonal, holistic, ontological agent-self, set in the stream of history, who develops a self-ideal, pursues goals, creates cultures, frets about his destiny, and whose search for truth must ultimately lead to God who is Truth.

The plan of the book is simple, orderly and easy to follow. The nineteen chapters are divided into five parts: "The Science of Psychology"; "Personality Structure"; "Personality Integration"; "Psychotherapy and Self-Integration"; and "Self-Integration Through Religion." Within this framework, the authors consider a wide variety of issues: the basic assumptions and principles of science in general and psychology in particular; the nature and function of "theory" in scientific work; scientific theories of personality; human and animal learning; the emotions as dynamic factors in personality development; freedom and determinism; counseling techniques, etc. Following an extensive and informative survey of other scientific theories of personality, the authors develop their own theory which includes human values and metaphysical meanings—a theory which they claim rests on scientific data and can be tested experimentally. Then they go on to show how this personalistic and existential conception of human nature provides a theoretical foundation for a psychotherapy which frankly incorporates Christian ideas and values.

A discussion of the role of religion in the "cure of souls" concludes the book. Here John Gasson, S.J., gives a most interesting and illuminating psychological analysis of the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius to show the dynamics and functions and results of religious ideas and disciplines in the effective integration of human personality. Ignatius was not a psychologist, nor was he interested in personality integration in a purely psychological sense—though the Exercises do in fact produce it. Professor Gasson argues on the basis of long experience as a director of "retreats" that the Exercises are a remarkable instrument of the soul's integration toward Christian perfection, "accomplished by grace but founded on nature."

Non-Catholic readers will be grateful for this volume, not only because it is a fine survey and analysis of what is happening in Catholic scholarship in the field of psychology, but because it gives evidence that these Catholic scholars are alive to the central theoretical and practical problems. All of the papers received the encouragement and genial criticism of Gordon W. Allport and Gardner Murphy. The general point of view is remarkably close to the personalistic views of Allport,

Murphy, and Stern; and there are clear and avowed affinities with the theory and therapy of Carl Rogers and Karen Horney, especially their concern for client-centered, nondirective therapy in which the interpersonal, noncoercive relationship between counselor and client offers both a model and a foundation for a mature relationship of the human person with God. But most naturalists and experimentalists will be annoyed to find such statements as those of Sister Annette Walters that the psychologist must "equip himself with a deep understanding of theology—especially the theology of grace and of the Mystical Body of Christ."

Such considerations will raise for some readers the question of whether Catholic scholarship can transcend dogma in sufficient measure to permit disinterested research to do its work. Indeed, is any one of us capable of completely disinterested work? Even the secular scientist has, consciously or unconsciously, his basic assumptions and cosmic allegiances. Reading this book has confirmed my feeling that there are complexities in the picture of Catholicism and Science which should prevent one from making any simple and sweeping judgment about the role of the Church vis-a-vis Science. The facts do not justify the judgments of those who simply equate Catholicism with reaction and imagine that all Catholic scholarship is antiscientific. The area of Catholic freedom is wider than most non-Catholics see or understand. Catholics can learn from the best in modern secular thought—just as we all can.

It is surprising how similar are the answers of the Christian faith and the wisest of the psychiatric approaches to the problems of human sin, anxiety, and crippling self-concern. Yet, I suspect, there are things psychiatry cannot do. The sin of self-love is not going to be easily eliminated by analysis or education alone. There is surely a dimension of grace present in all life on which the wise therapist, physician, pastor and priest will finally rely.

PAUL E. PFUETZE

Professor of Philosophy, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

**From Faith to Faith: Essays on Old Testament Literature.** By B. DAVIE NAPIER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955. 223 pp. \$3.00.

Professor Napier of Yale Divinity School has produced in this, his first book, a very useful and interesting group of essays, designed to stimulate interest in the Old Testament and help the reader in actually reading the Bible itself. He seeks to show that there is an essential unity of theological presuppositions underlying the five types of literature he treats: myth, legend, history, prophecy, and law. The title of the book is derived from the belief that the literature in all of its types came into being from faith, and was all addressed to faith.

The six central themes of the community of Israel which gave the Old Testament unity are, briefly stated, the following: (1) faith in creation; (2) the nature of human sinfulness; (3) divine judgment, which is partly punitive, but ultimately redemptive; (4) the covenant faith; (5) the theme of redemption, present from the beginning; and (6) the consummation as the necessary ultimate extension of faith affirming the absolute sovereignty of God.

The author seeks constantly to show the meaning of the Old Testament faith as a whole, and in these central themes. Though he makes use of the work of literary critics, and finds it impossible to get away from the familiar JEDP of Pentateuchal criticism, he thinks that many Old Testament scholars of a former generation were "scalpel happy," and he wishes to prove that even editors could be cre-

ative and important. He quotes with favor the suggestion of Franz Rosenzweig that we ought to think of the symbol R as standing, not for "Redactor," but for Hebrew *Rabbenu*, "Our Master." Sometimes of course this is true, but surely not always!

Napier rightly insists that there are various levels of interpretation. For example, in dealing with myths, we must distinguish the following: the aetiological meaning, the theology of the author, the theology of the editor, and the wider context of the faith of Israel and even of the Christian faith.

The two opening sections on myth and legend, covering the two parts of Genesis (chaps. 1-11 and chaps. 12-50) have struck this reviewer as the most valuable and original essays here. There is an excellent account of the differences between myth, legend, and history, and their relative value on pp. 71-80. This should be read in connection with the contemporary interest in demythologizing (or remythologizing) stimulated by the work of Rudolf Bultmann in Germany.

The chapter on history, designed to accompany the reading of I Sam. 12—I Kings 11, offers little that is new. It is hard to follow Napier's view that even II Sam. 9-20 is "an interpretation of human events through the eyes of profound faith." The chapter on prophecy is devoted almost exclusively to Isaiah, and is an excellent study. Napier says that the Old Testament prophet never thought of himself as a thinker but "as responder. He is, in the bare plain, nonphilosophical sense of the term, an existentialist." (p. 172.) The final section on law is so wide in its sweep that the author has room only for generalities. He is careful to insist on the great superiority of Hebrew law over the law of other ancient Oriental nations, because it was constantly derived from religion.

This highly useful book cannot fail to prompt one or two adverse criticisms. Occasionally the author seems to lapse into allegory or "eisegesis," as when he says that the forbidden tree was "in the midst of" Eden because Israel believed "that the decision of human will is never peripheral but 'in the midst,' that the choice of obedience or rebellion is always in the center, always the central quality of human life in creation" (p. 41). This latter is true, but hardly to be derived from the location of the forbidden tree. Also, one is tempted to suggest that this book—representing a point of view which is becoming more important in biblical study—would be more useful for the average reader if the author had avoided the technical jargon that appears so often. And finally, it may be no accident that the author has omitted a study of the wisdom literature, for that type of literature is not very congenial to the existentialist point of view.

J. PHILIP HYATT

Professor of Old Testament, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

**New Testament Faith for Today.** By AMOS N. WILDER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955. 186 pp. \$2.50.

Wilder is both a leading biblical scholar and an active participant in the modern poetic phrasing of life's dilemma and ultimate reality. He understands the difficulties which many find in the biblical message. He sees that while the biblical interpreter must focus attention on the strangeness of biblical assumptions and conceptions for our day, he must also show the modern man how he can accept these assumptions and conceptions as his own. What makes this acceptance possible? It is the fact that faith "is always richer than any particular formulation," and "the most adequate

statement of faith will always have a pictorial and imaginative character" (p. 13). Just now "we are in an interim period between an old and a new formulation of the Christian religion" (p. 14), but we must seek a new formulation, for "this faith . . . necessarily involves doctrine" (p. 12).

Chapter One deals with this problem of "Commending the Gospel in Our Time." The next chapter, on "The Language of Faith," begins by recognizing that "the words and images of the New Testament seem more and more to belong to a foreign language and a strange outlook" (p. 38). But it argues that to deal with the total depth and range of life requires symbol and mythopoetic language; "great faiths must have a special kind of language and . . . the Christian faith *has* a special kind of language which in many particulars cannot be dispensed with or replaced" (p. 49).

Three chapters then deal with "The Proclamation of Jesus," "The Message of Paul," and "The Johannine Witness." Wilder shows that despite their differences these three messages have a basic unity and all present a vital, adequate, and permanently valid gospel. Wilder wars against the perennial tendency to harden the Christian message into a fixed formulation which conceals the depth and the symbolic character of the Christian language. He is equally militant against persistent attempts to spiritualize the gospel and so detach it from living relation to the everyday aspects of human life.

The Conclusion summarizes the argument and examines sympathetically Bultmann's attempt to restate the Christian message in terms of existentialist philosophy. While recognizing that this attempt is in many ways illuminating, Wilder concludes that it unnecessarily depreciates the pictorial language of the New Testament. The Christian message must continually receive new formulations, but we must not fear deep-reaching symbols, for "the most potent, dramatic, and paradoxical imagery is essential" (p. 181).

I wish only to state bluntly one point, which I think Wilder would accept. Admittedly we must work to show the gospel's relevance and challenge by phrasing it in various ways. We must always beware lest any restatement lose some essential of the New Testament message. But since each Protestant Christian is to use the Bible for himself, he must become so familiar with the imagery and symbols of the Bible, and so able to grasp their deep meaning and challenge, that they are the fruitful medium through which God speaks to him. No matter how much modern statements of the truth may help the lay Protestant—and he needs such statements to help him sense the living truth and urgent appeal of the biblical word—he has to become so much at home in the biblical language that it speaks directly to him with power and inescapable urgency.

FLOYD V. FILSON

Dean and Professor of New Testament Literature and History, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

**Selections From the Psalms: Luther's Works, Volume XII.** Edited by JAROSLAV PELIKAN. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, and Philadelphia, Pa.: Muhlenberg Press, 1955. 410 pp. \$5.00.

The thought of Martin Luther is scarcely less important than his work. Indeed, it was the mind of the Reformer which initiated the Reformation. After Luther did his gigantic work on earth, the spirit of that work lived and continued to operate in

the lives of his followers through the great ideas he bequeathed to posterity. Those same ideas operate today, in as effective manner as they operated during the sixteenth century.

It is like going out into fresh air after a long stay in a stuffy room when we turn away from the complex expressions of contemporary theology to the clear, candid, straightforward speech of this great theologian. If one should try to rank Luther, theologically speaking, one would put him in the first category of the thinkers of all times. Luther would take his place side by side with Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Calvin. Among Protestant minds there is none greater than Luther.

The Concordia Publishing House and the Muhlenberg Press have combined resources to bring out the largest English translation of the works of Martin Luther. This work is to comprise sixty-five volumes. However, the first volume released in the series was not, as would normally be expected, the first volume, chronologically speaking, of Luther's writing. Rather it was the twelfth volume—his commentary on certain selected psalms.

I personally am glad that the Press released Volume XII first. That is as good an introduction to Luther as I know anything about. Luther, primarily, was a preacher. Here you have an example of his preaching skill at its very best. Therefore, exposition is the proper door to open to enter into an acquaintance with the thinking of the sixteenth-century giant.

Seven psalms have been selected for treatment: Psalm 2, Psalm 8, Psalm 19, Psalm 23, Psalm 26, Psalm 45, and Psalm 51. Perhaps the treatment of Psalm 51 is the best in the book. After all, Luther's great concern was with forgiveness. Here he has at his disposal material aplenty for any idea about forgiveness he wants to expose.

David was a man after God's own heart. Yet David committed a crime as heinous as any committed in the history of criminology. God was able to take this man and to make out of him the sweet singer of Israel and the Hebrews' greatest king. This should be all the encouragement anybody needs to accept forgiveness and by faith in Christ to believe that God is able to use him in a way that God sees best. It is no wonder that the psalm is introduced in printed form under the statement: "This excellent exposition of the fifty-first psalm by the Reverend Father Doctor Martin Luther has been published for the glory of God and the good of the Church." The Church could never have become the Church if it were not for forgiveness.

In each one of his treatments Doctor Luther uses the method of verse-by-verse exposition. Look at the second psalm, for example. There is an entire sermon under each verse. A modern preacher would have in Psalm 2 a whole series of evening messages, as many as there are verses in the psalm. Perhaps Luther used this same method, though I am inclined to think that he boiled down the substance of what is printed here into a single sermonic exposition from the pulpit. As you know, the psalms were the subject of a course of lectures he gave at the University. In those lectures he naturally dealt verse by verse with his material. Consequently the course went for a semester or a year.

These volumes will come out, two or three a year, for the next several years. Every minister should own them. They should be a part of any theologically minded person's library.

**WILLIAM R. CANNON**

Dean of The Candler School of Theology of Emory University, Emory University, Georgia.

**Aquinas.** By F. C. COPLESTON. A Pelican Book. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1955. 263 pp. 85 cents.

**The Faith of the Apostles' Creed.** By JAMES FRANKLIN BETHUNE-BAKER. Abridged and edited by W. NORMAN PITTINGER. Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1955. 95 pp. \$1.00.

Though diverse in content, the two books here reviewed have several features in common. Each in effect aims to make available for contemporary use the work of a thinker of the past, since Dr. Pittenger's abridgement does for the Edwardian modernist what Fr. Copleston's survey does for the thirteenth-century friar. (I say Edwardian advisedly, since although Bethune-Baker's *Faith of the Apostles' Creed* was published in 1918, it is the work of a mind formed in the intellectual climate of some years before.) Each presents solid thought in clear and largely nontechnical language; and each has the practical advantage of handy and inexpensive soft-cover format, Copleston's work as an addition to the valuable Pelican Philosophy Series, Pittenger's as a separate publication of the Seabury Press.

In retrospect Bethune-Baker, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, deserves the description that Pittenger gives him, "a distinguished representative of a profoundly Anglican and Catholic 'modernism'" (p. 6). The book now re-edited was originally issued for a double purpose, to defend the modernist handling of details of the Creed, and to exhibit a solid and sound faith which might legitimately claim to be a twentieth-century understanding of what the authors of the Creed were saying in the terms of their day. The author was careful not to claim that he had removed mythology and arrived at absolute truth, but that he tried to say in terms of the twentieth century what the historic Creed first put in terms of the second or fourth. Pittenger's very skillful abridgement leaves out the sections related to controversies of the 1900's, and produces a smooth-running statement of positive teaching.

Not all who wish to state the ancient faith in modern terms would agree with all points, but on the whole Bethune-Baker reads today more like a pillar of orthodoxy than an innovator. Consider, for instance, the meaning that he finds in the often neglected clause, "descended into hell": "The full manhood and human experiences of Christ, the idea of an 'intermediate state' after death, the hallowing of the state of the faithful departed, and the universality and absoluteness of the Gospel" (p. 51). "No mean part of the common Christian Faith," as the author observes.

Bethune-Baker was engaged in controversy with Charles Gore, as modernist against conservative; but forty years later similarities seem more conspicuous than differences. Both aimed to commend in modern terms the historic faith of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and belief in Jesus Christ who for us was wonderfully born, lived, died, and rose again; both perhaps lacked a bit the sense of the anguish of the human condition which now drives us more urgently to the Gospel of the Grace of God; both still have a word to say to the present time, and not to Anglicans alone. I had expected to find in a writer of Bethune-Baker's position a certain blandness and generality. Instead I find his one conspicuous confusion, which affects the order though not the content of the book, is a piece of misplaced concreteness; since "of Christian theology the center is not God, but Jesus" (p. 18), belief in Christ should come before belief in God, and is so here treated. I am convinced that Bethune-Baker here really misrepresents both the historic faith and the structure of his own thought, as the reading of his book will show.

Fr. Copleston, Professor at Heythrop College, Oxon., and the Gregorian Uni-

versity at Rome, attempts a task both larger and smaller. Already a distinguished historian of philosophy, he here gives a clear presentation of both thirteenth-century and contemporary Thomist philosophical convictions, leaving out the Christian theology which St. Thomas Aquinas certainly distinguished clearly in theory but never separated precisely in his exposition. This is Thomism simply presented, but not jazzed up for the casual reader; the book assumes an interest in the subject, though not any previous acquaintance with its particular technical terms. Successive chapters treat of the world and metaphysics, God and Creation, the nature of man, and the principles of personal and social ethics. The final chapter on Thomism since St. Thomas' day I found particularly fascinating, including its brief treatment of the fact that while in principle Thomism stands as a possible human philosophy among others, it is *de facto* almost exclusively held by Catholics or by "thinkers whose religious convictions approximate to those of the Catholics" (p. 239). Is it perhaps that the particular Thomistic balance of essence and existence, and delimitation of the realm of reason, fits in with one particular type of conviction about divine truth?

This and other interesting questions are suggested incidentally in the course of Copleston's valuable exposition of what Thomism actually is. His writing amply illustrates that one can be loyal to a historic philosophic tradition and at the same time truly progressive, alert to new problems and new sources of information. The unpretentious format of his work should not disguise the fact that he has produced an authoritative introduction to the summary of the topic, and one may say as much in its own field for Pittenger's edition of Bethune-Baker.

E. R. HARDY

Professor of Church History, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

**The Protestant Tradition; An Essay in Interpretation.** By J. S. WHALE. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 360 pp. \$3.75.

The main strength of this very strong book lies in its acute interpretation and magnificent presentation of the main stream of conservative Protestant theology and especially of the sources of that stream in the thought of Luther and Calvin. For this task the author is equipped in the highest degree by the insight which enables him to unfold the essential religious values in even their most extreme and, to modern ears, untenable and repulsive statements, no less than by his ripe erudition as theologian and historian. Moreover, his skill and felicity as a writer make the reading of his exposition always a lively and often an exhilarating experience.

He does not, of course, underwrite every doctrinal declaration made by those two great sixteenth-century theologians. Speaking of Luther, he says: "In its high sacramentalism and its classic creedal orthodoxy, his understanding of religion was ancient rather than modern" (p. 8). (For "ancient" read "medieval" and the thought will be clearer.) And yet: "Though he was not, of course, the sole source of the evangelical faith and churchmanship of the modern world, he was its principal source." It appears, then, that in the author's view the essential and indispensable element in the modern Protestant heritage is this body of "classic creedal orthodoxy" which, formulated in the fourth and fifth centuries, was thereafter the core of Roman Catholic theology and, in and after the sixteenth century, of all the Protestant theology that is worth taking into account.

The weakness of Dr. Whale's exposition and defense of the Protestant faith, as seen from this reviewer's point of view, lies in his virtually complete omission of any reference to any strain of what may be called liberal thought in the Protestant tradition. This, in my judgment, results in an unbalanced picture of the history of Protestant thought, an inadequate audit of the present total resources of Protestantism, and, at the end, an oversimplification of the ecumenical problem. The validity of this criticism does not depend upon the *rightness* of the course of liberalizing thought in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, but only upon recognition of its historical and present actuality—unless, of course, one is prepared to say that it was actual but *wrong*, and that therefore it is to be considered an aberration from true Protestantism and not a legitimate part of the Protestant heritage. I do not think Dr. Whale would say this; but by implication at least he comes very close to equating "the Protestant tradition" with "traditional Protestantism."

Like so many English nonconformists, Dr. Whale is tender in his treatment of the type of church which by definition includes the total population of a nation (Troeltsch's "church-type" church), though of course he rejects the tactics of persecution and compulsion without which it never has been and never can be attained, and repudiates Bellarmine's declaration that the church does not require personal faith in all its members—though this condition is inseparable from that kind of church. He sees some value in the "gathered church" (Troeltsch's "sect-type") in that it requires personal faith, but thinks this is purchased at too high a price because it "divides the Body of Christ"—as though a church composed of believers and unbelievers united by compulsion could possibly *be* the Body of Christ. Yet again and again the author returns to the central truth that the only true body of unity for the church is faith in Christ and his gospel.

In his closing section on "Modern Issues," after an excellent but somewhat marginal chapter on "The Roman Church and Toleration," the author writes warm and welcome words concerning the ecumenical movement. This chapter will repay careful study, as indeed the whole book will. The urgency with which Dr. Whale presents this problem is itself a contribution to its solution. Certainly that movement can be advanced only by those who regard it as important and who refuse to be intimidated by the obvious difficulties or even by the apparent impossibilities.

One cannot but appreciate the generous spirit which leads the author, a Congregationalist, to say that, since each communion must be prepared to "give up some cherished feature of its own architecture" in order to build the structure of a united church, he himself "must be prepared to accept some form of episcopacy, however much this may offend his inherited suspicions of the claims made in its name" (p. 342). The temper here is admirable, but the logic is weak. If the bond of unity is a common faith in Christ and his gospel, why must there be agreement on a certain pattern of church polity? The underlying assumption is that a church is not united unless it has a united ecclesiastical structure; and the pragmatic argument from that point is that, since we all know that the Episcopalians won't give up episcopacy, everybody else must accept it.

I am willing to defend in any forum the proposition that there can never be a united church which treats as an essential anything which its members do not consider as essential to the *Church*. Having myself done what I could through a great many years to promote the ecumenical ideal, I am always disturbed to find, especially from

the pen of an exceptionally competent free-churchman, a prospectus of a "united church" of which I could not be a member.

**W. E. GARRISON**

Chairman of the Department of Philosophy and Religion, University of Houston, Houston, Texas.

**How to Preach to People's Needs.** By EDGAR N. JACKSON. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 191 pp. \$2.75.

Edgar Newman Jackson, pastor of Mamaroneck Methodist Church, New York, and president of the New Rochelle Guidance Center, graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University and Yale Divinity School, and studied at the Postgraduate Center for Psychotherapy in New York City. He has written articles for *The Christian Century*, *Pastoral Psychology*, the *Christian Advocate*, and is the author of *This Is My Faith*.

The present volume's purpose is clear from its title, and also from its dedication: "to my father who from my earliest memory to this day has made preaching an important healing instrument." In the concluding chapter, after suggesting books for a "basic library of human needs," Mr. Jackson says, "If . . . these pages have served to awaken a new interest in what goes on in preaching, and what may be done to heal the souls of those who come seeking a more abundant life, their purpose will have been served."

Seeking to realize this goal, he contends that preaching and counseling are complementary and that the preacher may extend and strengthen his counseling by his pulpit utterance. In each chapter he deals with a special emotional problem: guilt, sorrow, fear, and the like; and in each chapter, he follows analysis of the problem under scrutiny with résumés of sermons which he feels have treated the problem effectively.

Mr. Jackson believes that preaching can and should be a therapeutic tool, that to be this it must face reality honestly and lead toward goals which are reasonable and challenging to the best in life. Obviously, the preacher must know people's needs if he is to use the sermon as a healing influence.

What are some of these needs? In a congregation of 500, a fifth will be recently bereaved, a third will be married persons dealing with serious stresses of personality, a half will have problems of adjustment to school, work, home, or community that endanger their happiness, a fifth suffer from guilt feelings so intense that health is jeopardized, and there are present a considerable number of neurotics. When these "come asking for bread in the form of understanding life's meaning, guidance . . . shall they be handed a stone of meaningless exposition or theological abstraction?"

I have such sympathy and agreement with most of what Mr. Jackson says that I am reluctant to confess, as I must, that I am less confident than he about the therapeutic (using the term precisely) values of preaching. For persons not seriously disturbed, direct, reasoned advices will have value in so far as they are sound, understanding, and communicated successfully. But where mental illness is dealt with, the best sermon is not likely to prove an adequate tool, though it may bring comfort and strength.

Nevertheless, this is a work of many excellences: a readable style, searching and useful insights, sensitive understanding of and devoted concern for troubled

people, and much wise blending of the religious and the psychological. It says, strongly, that a sermon should be more than an aimless flight of rhetoric or a spate of diffuse piety. And it raises primary questions for the preacher: Who are you talking to? How can you be helpful?

HARRY M. TAYLOR

Calvary Methodist Church, East Orange, New Jersey.

**They Seek a Country: The American Presbyterians.** Ed. by GAIUS JACKSON SLOSSER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. xvi-330 pp. \$4.75.

Lectures delivered during October, 1953, as parts of a symposium lie behind the chapters of this historical survey. Except for Professors Latourette and Sweet and the novelist, Gladys Schmitt, the contributors are all affiliated with Presbyterian churches, colleges, or seminaries. It may be, therefore, that this co-operative effort by representatives of the various branches of the denomination is in itself something of a milestone in Presbyterian history. A recapitulation of the lectures best suggests the scope of the volume:

- I. *Origins*, Gaius Jackson Slosser.
- II. *Beginnings in the North*, William W. McKinney.
- III. *Beginnings in the South*, Ernest Trice Thompson.
- IV. *The United Presbyterian Church*, John H. Gerstner, Jr.
- V. *The Reformed Presbyterian Church in America*, David M. Carson.
- VI. *The Founding of Educational Institutions*, William W. Sweet.
- VII. *Service in Founding and Preserving the Nation*, H. Gordon Harold.
- VIII. *Missionary Expansion at Home*, Clifford M. Drury.
- IX. *Serving Overseas*, Kenneth Scott Latourette.
- X. *Wrestling With Human Values: The Slavery Years*, Edward B. Welsh.
- XI. *Events and Trends—Early Nineteenth Century*, James H. Nichols.
- XII. *Some Trends and Events Since 1869*, Lefferts A. Loetscher.
- XIII. *Today and Tomorrow: The Road Ahead*, Gladys Schmitt, Frank H. Caldwell, John A. Mackay.

In evaluating a work such as this, it is useless to expand upon the difficulties of transmuting separately conceived essays into unified history. The problems are well-nigh insuperable; but this book, nevertheless, makes some solid contributions. Chapter X contains a good account of the short-lived Free Presbyterian Church which between 1847 and the Civil War set itself apart in order to participate more fully in the antislavery movement. Chapter XI contains a penetrating and timely analysis of the ecclesiological and sacramental controversies aroused by the "Mercersburg theologians," John W. Nevin and Philip Schaff. Most of the other chapters supply entirely adequate summaries of the stated topics.

With regard to balance and comprehensiveness the volume leaves much to be desired. The United Presbyterian Church of nearly 300,000 members is treated with no more detail than the Reformed Presbyterian Church with 13,500 members. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church (except for occasional remarks) is not covered at all, either with regard to the century before its return to the parent church or for the half-century history of the "nonreturning" group, whose present strength is about 110,000. J. Gresham Machen and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church are not so much as mentioned, nor are the theological issues that occasioned that rupture in 1936.

The vast task of interpretation that is posed by American Presbyterianism is also left for the most part unfaced. Nowhere is the nature and spirit of Calvinism carefully portrayed. The European background of Presbyterianism is not cohesively treated. Chapter VII falls far short of doing justice to the problem of relating Calvinism to the growth of democratic institutions. Nowhere in the book, moreover, does anyone discuss the marked tendency of Presbyterianism to settle its problems by organizational division. (This despite the fact that there are included in the volume two excellent charts: one setting forth the bewildering series of schisms and unions of the Scottish churches: the other, the similar fate of their American counterparts.) Indeed a retrospective thoughtfulness with regard to the tradition as a whole is what this volume chiefly lacks.

The book is profusely illustrated with portraits of distinguished Presbyterians, from John Knox to Dwight D. Eisenhower. A "Who's Who" gives the main facts about each. Another appendix lists educational institutions, here and abroad, which are associated with Presbyterianism in one way or another. In addition to fairly extensive annotation for each chapter, there is a general bibliography. The volume is indexed.

SYDNEY E. AHLSTROM

Assistant Professor of American Church History, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

**Many Things in Parables: Expository Studies.** By RONALD S. WALLACE. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1955. vii-218 pp. 15s.

To publish a book on the Parables requires courage and self-confidence. The field in recent years has been very thoroughly traversed. One thinks of works of scholarship like those of C. H. Dodd and B. T. D. Smith, and of popular expositions slanted at preachers such as have come from the pens—and pulpits—of George Buttrick and Leslie Weatherhead, and wonders whether there is much to say that has not already been well said.

Ronald Wallace, a Scottish Presbyterian minister and the author of an earlier book on Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, while he probably would not justify the appearance of the present volume on the score of striking originality, holds the conviction that there is a need in the Church for the publication of current biblical exposition. He has obviously given careful study to the work of his predecessors but he shows a fine independence of approach and judgment, and it is clear enough to the reader that, by virtue of his command of his subject, he has the moral right to take his own line. Equally clear as regards his theological position is his indebtedness to the Reformers and to European theologians like Brunner, Barth and Heim.

Here indeed, for Americans, lies the special interest of this book. It is a pointer to the character and trend of biblical exposition in Scotland today. "Conservative" is the word that best describes it. We are also offered a clue to the nature of present-day Scottish preaching. The author indicates that the expositions served as the source for a series of Sunday evening sermons. (There are twenty-four in all, and most of them were drawn upon for the pulpit. Were they preached in succession or at stated intervals?) They are directed in the main towards ministers and church school teachers and are deserving of attention, for they combine undoubted scholarship and homiletical insight.

Men who major in topical preaching may not find the book to their mind.

The exposition is solidly biblical and even contemporary references are rare. There is hardly any hint of what is happening in Scotland or the world at large in these pages. The contrast in this regard with Buttrick is most marked. But it is no less so with Weatherhead. The tendency is toward otherworldliness. What, noting the omission, one begins to look for and finally never really encounters, is an emphatic stress on the relation and relevance of Christ's teaching to economic and political life as well as to personal life.

On both sides of the Atlantic there is a revived interest in expository preaching. This is partly the result of the new and growing place given to biblical theology. It can be productive of great good. When biblical exposition is systematic and frequent it delivers the preacher from indulging his own predilections and keeps him close to his standard frame of reference. It provides him, too, with limitless source material. With the Old and New Testaments to draw upon he need not, if he has any homiletical instinct at all, be mentally impoverished or keep asking himself, after the fashion of some topical preachers, "How can I ever keep this up?" and "Will they come back and keep coming back?"

But, and the point can hardly be overemphasized, the primary consideration in biblical exposition is to keep close to contemporary life. If one has misgivings about *Many Things in Parables* it is principally on this account. It is too detached from the activities and concerns of everyday existence. It lacks contemporaneity and the bite of relevance. It would be strengthened every way if the biblical insights were more practically applied to current life situations.

ROBERT J. McCACKEN

The Riverside Church, Riverside Drive at 122nd Street, New York City.

**The Development of Modern Christianity Since 1500.** By FREDERICK A. NORWOOD. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 256 pp. \$3.75.

After an introductory chapter which moves rapidly from the period of the early Church to the eve of the Reformation, Professor Norwood covers the remainder of Church History in four chapters, respectively entitled, "The Age of Reform," "The Age of Enlightenment," "The Age of Progress," and "The Age of Turmoil." In themselves these chapter headings are not too informative concerning the contents of the book, but they do suggest the comprehensive character of this volume.

There are definite features in the volume which merit special attention. Considerable space, considering the broad scope of the work, is given to the development of Eastern Orthodox thought and institutions. One is not accustomed to find this in books which are predominantly Protestant in nature. Attention is also given to the Roman Catholic development, including its relation to Protestantism and the cultural situation generally. Stress is also laid on the place of the Christian mission in its historical sweep throughout the world, including the implications for the ecumenical movement. In addition to these three special emphases, the author sets the total Christian movement into the context of the cultural and historical factors.

A book of this kind inevitably has certain limitations, since so much material needs to be covered in a short compass. The decision has obviously been made to feature the Church History side as over against the history of thought; and for the purpose of the book, it is a wise choice. It does mean, however, that in the light of this necessary self-limitation many issues do not come to crucial focus. Moreover, it

is frequently necessary to drop the issues in order to get ahead with the story. Two random illustrations will suffice: for instance, the Great Awakenings never come to focus, nor does the problem which arose out of Darwinian science.

Certainly a book of this type needs to be judged in the light of those for whom it was written. At the same time it is not altogether clear for what group it was intended. One would assume that it is for the average reader who is not a specialist in either theology or Church history. In this respect, it will undoubtedly serve a useful purpose. One could wish perhaps that a bit more of the theological or religious issues might have been focused. What is said generally follows traditional and safe patterns and sometimes partially distorts because of the demand for oversimplification.

In respect to interpretation, two sections raise questions. Historically, the term "Enlightenment" does not start as early as it is used in this book. The greater difficulty, however, arises in the section on the Age of Turmoil. This may be inevitable, since we are all too close to this period to see it in perspective. Nevertheless, is it adequate, in covering the period from 1914 to 1955, to deal with the place and significance of Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr in five or six sentences out of forty pages?

JOHN DILLENBERGER

Associate Professor of Theology, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge 38, Mass.

**A Modern Philosophy of Religion.** By SAMUEL M. THOMPSON. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955. xvii-601 pp.

Three important problems in the general field of the philosophy of religion are given serious consideration in this volume. The first is the problem of religion and knowledge. This is treated in Parts I-III, under such general topics as religion and philosophy, faith and knowledge, and truth. The second problem centers in man and human destiny. It is discussed in chapters ten to twelve, and twenty-seven to twenty-nine inclusive. The third problem is that of God and constitutes the heart of the book, approximately two-thirds of its content.

The method adopted by the author (professor of philosophy at Monmouth College, Illinois) is commendable. "My aim is not to explore various philosophies of religion, or to provide a guide-book to the maze of religious thought, but to lead the reader through the development of a positive argument" (p. vii). Mr. Thompson accepts a realistic epistemology essentially Aristotelian in orientation. Unlike Aristotle, however, who based his metaphysics upon physics, Thompson appears to reject this approach through science. "Once we understand that physics does not define reality we realize that it leaves room for any positive metaphysics not in conflict with physics' own presuppositions. The proper influence of physics on metaphysics is not positive but negative; it does not prescribe what metaphysics shall find, but merely proscribes what is inconsistent with its own possibility." (p. x) Defining truth as "conformity of perception or thought with being" (p. 108), the author distinguishes *essential* truth from *existential*. The first is descriptive of any given existent or class of realities; the second affirms that something exists.

In considering man and human destiny, Thompson distinguishes two orders: Necessity and Freedom. The first is the natural order, the second the personal and divine. Granted human freedom, man must be considered more than natural. He is involved in nature and is to that extent part of the natural order. At the same time, if his possibility to think is granted, he belongs to the order of freedom. This means that man is a dual being; through his body he participates in nature; through

his mind in a higher order. As he states it, "The knower of nature cannot be wholly a product of nature" (p. 176).

The third part of the book is devoted to the exposition and defense of theism. God is defined as "supreme and ultimate being," "the self-existing Cause of Nature" (p. 341). The rather long and detailed argument for the existence of God so defined is based on the assumption that nature may be defined absolutely in terms of necessity. "Only a world of nature which is dependent on and sustained by a real existent which is not itself a part of nature can show genuine novelty. For no natural order can produce the novel from itself." (p. 468) It is evident, of course, that this assumption is subject to serious criticism. Until the case is made that necessity is natural and novelty is not, the argument for God presented here must be considered inconclusive.

Thompson's argument rests upon the assumption that "all events have causes," the theory of absolute causality held by Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, and Immanuel Kant. But Newton and Einstein found it possible to understand events much more readily in terms of "some events have causes" (Newton) and "no events have causes" (Einstein). It would appear, then, that Thompson's argument for the existence of God requires him to repudiate the presuppositions upon which much of our thinking is now based. It is at best a questionable foundation upon which to construct so ambitious a structure.

There is, furthermore, no apparent interest in verifiability. Religion is defined with little if any evidential support. It should be obvious that when one asserts that "religion is," he has in fact presented a proposition whose truth or falsity is subject to verification or disproof. Modern thinkers, for whom this "modern" philosophy of religion was presumably written, have become weary of nonverified and non-verifiable theories. As Whitehead pointed out some thirty years ago, hypotheses unsupported by facts merit little attention. Pitting theory against theory, without seeking positive support for any of them, does little to push back the boundaries of human ignorance. Another curious phenomenon: some fifty-one pages are devoted to "The Nature of Man," and not a single psychologist, with the exception of Aristotle (if one still calls him that), is listed!

Having made these critical comments, one should observe that this book is well written. It shows the results of many long hours of research, and contains interesting sidelights. The author is to be commended for his thoughtfulness and enterprise. But as an attempt to further man's quest for a deeper understanding of religion, or more adequate knowledge of God, the book leaves something to be desired.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT

Professor of Philosophy of Religion and Christian Ethics, The Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado.

**Milton and the Angels.** By ROBERT H. WEST. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1955. ix-238 pp. \$4.50.

It is generally agreed that Milton is "on the side of the angels," though some have suspected it was the bad angels he chiefly preferred. Now Professor West, an authority on Elizabethan ghosts and magic, has scrutinized Milton's good angels in particular. He is struck, and rightly so, by their need for solid nourishment and their capacity for real love-making.

Some of the orthodox may allege that such angelic attributes are a hindrance rather than a help in justifying the ways of God to men; but it was germane to Milton's purpose to make the ways of angels as like those of ideal man as possible. "Milton is showing the ways of the world as not in themselves defective," "uniting man to heaven, judiciously exalting the life of God's earth."

Milton was of course more of a Christian Humanist than Calvin might have liked; he followed the modified Calvinism of an Arminius and a Grotius. Yet even Calvin might, if pressed, have agreed that Milton, as Christian poet and Christian theologian, had the heart of the matter in him. For he did hold in honor "the holy witnesses of God's glory," and enjoyed them with devotion.

*Milton and the Angels* is a valuable addition to the Christian understanding of Milton, and also sheds considerable light on the farther reaches of what many, without the guidance of Mr. West, might too casually dismiss as the dismal science of angelology. For one of the basic enterprises of theology, or a central dogmatic theme if you prefer that way of putting it, is the attempt to discriminate between what is *done* in the world and what *happens* in it, between what is due to personal activity and what is effected by impersonal forces. Now, if one allows a main role to personal agency, must one not go on to envisage the possibility that there are "agents for certain events to which theologians did not suppose God to condescend and to which man was not equal"? And these are the angels.

Catholic angelologists tend to explore the subject pretty extensively; Protestant and Puritan authors have a certain reserve. For example, should or shouldn't one allow Satan to be called Lucifer on the basis of a figurative interpretation of Isa. 14:12? can what is said of the king of Babylon be made to apply to the king of Hell? But more striking than such differences is the large measure of agreement between Catholic and early Protestant. Indeed, John Salkeld's *Treatise of Angels*, published in the reign of James I, proudly advertised that the author had been an assistant to the famous Jesuit, Francis Suarius. And as Professor West comments: "That Salkeld could confidently offer such credentials to his very Protestant Majesty and to the Protestant public of England is some evidence of how largely, in this subject particularly, Protestant thought still rested on the great scholastic rationalization."

T. S. K. SCOTT-CRAIG

Professor of Philosophy, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

## Book Notices

*Religious Freedom in Spain: Its Ebb and Flow* is a book by J. D. Hughey, Jr. (Broadman Press, Nashville, Tennessee, \$3.00). Dr. Hughey lived in Spain from 1947 to 1950 as a representative of the Southern Baptists, and is now teaching at the Baptist Theological Seminary, Ruschlikon-Zürich, Switzerland. In Spain he collected data on the contemporary situation, then searched further for its roots in the past. He traces the history from the Catholic unity of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the subsequent rise of liberalism, the establishment of religious freedom in the Revolution of 1868, the compromise on "religious toleration" under the restored Bourbon monarchy, the separation of Church and State under the Republic of 1931, and the present totalitarian return to Catholic unity. The book is thoroughly documented, but reportorial and readable.

The Mennonites have recently produced two large volumes that are definitive for the study of their history. One is *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons* (c. 1496-1561), translated from the Dutch, edited by John C. Wenger and prefaced by Harold S. Bender's "brief biography" of this lesser-known but significant Reformation leader. (Mennonite Publishing House, or Herald Press, 610-616 Walnut Avenue, Scottdale, Pennsylvania, \$8.75). The other is Volume I of *The Mennonite Encyclopedia*, edited by Harold S. Bender and C. Henry Smith, same publisher. The other three volumes will come out in 1956, 1957, 1958. Price \$10.00 per volume, or \$33.75 for the set if ordered now. Historians and scholars of the various North American and European Mennonite bodies have combined to report all aspects of Mennonite history and culture. The print is readable, and fascinating illustrative plates are included.

Two books have come out about the Salvation Army. *Soldiers Without Swords*, by Herbert A. Wisbey, Jr., is the first published history of the Salvation Army in the United States (Macmillan, \$4.00). It "encompasses the activities of this unique organization from the pioneer party which landed at Castle Garden, New York City, to the seventy-fifth anniversary celebration" last year. *Happy Warriors*, by Pamela Search (Arco Publishing Company, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York, \$2.75) tells the story of the Salvation Army's social work, far more weighty than mere "drum-beating and evangelism"; its accomplishments have even "influenced social thinking and legislatures in our time."

Two more books on preaching! One is *The Primacy of Preaching Today* (Warrack Lectures for 1954), by Arthur A. Cowan of Inverleith Church, Edinburgh (Scribner, \$2.50). Besides the title lecture, he treats of expository preaching of the Old and New Testaments and doctrinal preaching based on the Christian Year. The other is *Preaching on the Books of the New Testament*, by Dwight E. Stevenson of the College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky (Harper, \$3.95). "Here is a striking new idea in Biblical preaching—sermons on the *whole* of each book of the New Testament." Harold A. Bosley's *Sermons on the Psalms* (\$3.00) are also published by Harper. Among his evocative titles are: "Strange Delight" (Psalms 1, 8, 23); "Pick the Right Ancestors" (Psalm 16; preached on July 4th); "When I Am With God" (Psalm 19); "That Generations to Come May Know" (Psalm 78:1-8); "The Lost Secret of Great Religion" (Psalm 118); "Wanted: An Unpurchasable Man!" (Psalm 121:1-8; Psalm 127:1). "There is never any doubt as to their relevance to twentieth century life, and ability, grace and humor . . . mark the exposition."

Dartmouth Publications, Hanover, New Hampshire, has sent us a fine volume, *The Nobler Risk, and Other Sermons of Ambrose White Vernon*, edited by Roy S. Chamberlin (\$4.00). These seventeen sermons were chosen carefully from almost 600 which he left, with other writings, at his death in 1951; these were preached several times and widely remembered. "Almost every page bears testimony to the depth of his religious faith and his zeal in proclaiming the Christian Gospel, and to his unswerving but critical loyalty to the two historic institutions, Church and College, to which his life was dedicated—but only so long as the Church was a free one, and the College a liberal one."

Dr. Buttrick's successor as minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York, David H. C. Read, has written a simple but basic little book, *The Christian Faith* (Scribner's, \$1.95). "This book is written for those who want to know what the Christian Faith means as a system of thought and as a spur for action. Its purpose is primarily to explain rather than to commend. . . . The book was not difficult to write when I kept in mind various friends and acquaintances who have sceptical but enquiring minds."

*Vocabulary of Faith*, by Hampton Adams (Bethany Press, St. Louis, Missouri, \$2.50) is a "brief study of some words and phrases that are peculiar to Christian faith." He intends first to sharpen and freshen our understanding of words that have grown too familiar, and second, to show that the "language of the street" cannot carry the Christian gospel's full weight of meaning; certain old words like "Revelation," "Reconciliation," "Redemption," "Grace" must be kept. Dr. Adams is pastor of Park Avenue Christian Church, New York. A most helpful small book.

*The Drama of the Book of Revelation*, by John Wick Bowman (Westminster Press, \$2.50) is a noteworthy "endeavor to provide a wholesome guidebook to the most abused writing in the Christian Scriptures." He analyzes the structure of the Apocalypse, and (after the preliminary letters to the churches) presents the material as a drama, setting free translations by himself side by side with commentary. Stimulating for the modern reader.

Another book in the Association Press's fine "Rediscovering" series is *Rediscovering the Church*, by George Laird Hunt (\$3.00). "Written in layman's language, this book is the story of man's continuous struggle to achieve community from the beginnings of Christianity to the 20th century." The author (Presbyterian Board of Education) approaches his subject by examining the nature of true "community," how man lost it and how God in Christ restored it; the church is this community. From the same publisher comes *Beginnings in Theology*, by Jack Finegan, whose many books show him to be as gifted in writing for the lay reader as in his broad scholarship.

Garden City Books, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, sends us *The Bible in Story and Pictures* (\$5.95), revised from the original edition of *The Children's Story Bible*, by Harold Begbie. "No one tells the message of the Scriptures in story form better than Harold Begbie." A beautiful gift for any child.

Mention should also be made of *The Greatest Life*, by Frank C. Laubach (Revell, \$2.50). He has arranged a continuous story of the life of Christ, using the exact words of the Gospels according to the Goodspeed translation, except that it is told in the first person by Jesus. There is a real effectiveness in thus rewriting the Gospels as an "autobiography."

E. H. L.



